



THE FAMILY
IN A WORLD AT WAR

THE FAMILY IN A WORLD AT WAR

Edited by

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG

DIRECTOR, CHILD STUDY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

PAUL V. McNUTT · THOMAS T. MACKIE · LOUISE STANLEY
LAWRENCE K. FRANK · EDUARD C. LINDEMAN · ANNA M.
ROSENBERG · MARK A. McCLOSKEY · LEWIS B. HERSHEY
DAVID M. LEVY · EVERETT R. CLINCHY · PEARL S. BUCK
JAMES S. PLANT · SUSAN ISAACS · MARTHA M. ELIOT
DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER · ANNA W. M. WOLF · CARO-
LINE B. ZACHRY · ELEANOR D. ROOSEVELT · HOWARD Y.
McCLUSKY



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS

New York and London

THE FAMILY IN A WORLD AT WAR

*Copyright, 1942, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America*

All rights in this book are reserved.

*No part of the book may be reproduced in any
manner whatsoever without written permission
except in the case of brief quotations embodied
in critical articles and reviews. For information
address Harper & Brothers*

FIRST EDITION

E-R

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG	
The Family—War or Peace	I
PAUL V. McNUTT	
The Home Front and the National Defense	21
THOMAS T. MACKIE, M.D.	
Nutritional Aspects of Public Morale	37
LOUISE STANLEY	
Science of Nutrition at the Home Base	46
LAWRENCE K. FRANK	
The Family in the National Emergency	56
EDUARD C. LINDEMAN	
The American Family: Flexible and Resilient	69
ANNA M. ROSENBERG	
Social Security and the National Purpose	83
MARK A. McCLOSKEY	
Educational Problems in Camp and Community	93
LEWIS B. HERSHEY	
The Impact of the Draft on the American Family	107
DAVID M. LEVY, M.D.	
The Toll of Intolerance upon the Intolerant	117
EVERETT R. CLINCHY	
Unity in Diversity	125
PEARL S. BUCK	
At Home in the World	130
JAMES S. PLANT, M.D.	
Emotional Strains in Time of Crisis	143
SUSAN ISAACS	
Children of Great Britain in Wartime	156

MARTHA M. ELIOT, M.D.	
The Work of Women in England	175
DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER	
A Challenge to American Women	192
ANNA W. M. WOLF	
Women and War Jobs	206
CAROLINE B. ZACHRY	
The Adolescent and His Problems Today	219
ELEANOR D. ROOSEVELT	
Attitudes of Youth and Morale	230
HOWARD Y. McCLUSKY	
The Outlook of Youth in a World at War	237

APPENDICES

THE STAFF OF THE CHILD STUDY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA	
Children in Wartime	255
UNITED STATES CHILDREN'S BUREAU	
To Parents in Wartime	271
COMMISSION ON CHILDREN IN WARTIME, OF THE U. S. CHILDREN'S BUREAU	
A Children's Charter in Wartime	288
The Authors	296
Suggested Reading	298

FOREWORD

THIS BOOK was planned by the Board and the Staff of the Child Study Association of America when we were still uncertain how soon our nation would become actively involved in the war, although it was already obvious that we must eventually share in the world's convulsion. After Pearl Harbor, however, the problems and the issues became more sharply defined. Like the Association's annual Institute the book was planned in the conviction that time spent in evaluating and adjusting family relationships, as they are dramatized by today's crisis, is time well invested for assuring the goals of tomorrow—that thought given now to considering the needs of children and their parents will contribute substantially to winning the war.

In this time of crisis, fears reasonable and unreasonable add strain to family living. People fear not only the physical horrors of war in terms of bodily injury or death or loss of loved ones. They are troubled too by the more subtle terrors, by the threat of economic insecurity, of rising racial intolerance, of unpredictable social change—of the vague yet confusing shape of things to come. Now it is the family that gives or withholds that inner strength which people need in facing danger and uncertainty. The family gives or withholds that courageous love of life which greets the unknown as a challenge and which makes defeatism impossible. It is the family too that nurtures those gentle virtues which make it possible for men to live and work together in peace and harmony. Courage, integrity,

loyalty, kindness, generosity, tolerance—feelings and ideals to live by, and now to die for—these grow, if they grow at all, from the satisfying relationships of our childhood. Family morale is the basis of all morale.

The chapters in this book attempt to point out the role of the family in the war effort of the nation, and to suggest the peculiar dangers and strains to which the family is inevitably subjected. It is hoped that the facts and interpretations offered will help clarify the position of the family in the present emergency—and so help to strengthen the special precautions and services which will be needed for its protection.

On behalf of the Child Study Association of America, I wish to thank all who have so generously contributed to this book, and especially Mr. Eduard C. Lindeman, who assisted in the planning, and to my husband, Benjamin C. Gruenberg, whose editorial skill is reflected in the pages of this volume.

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG

THE FAMILY
IN A WORLD AT WAR

THE FAMILY— WAR OR PEACE

by

Sidonie Matsner Gruenberg

IN THESE perilous times not the least of the hazards which the nation faces is the inherent threat to family life. Families must become adjusted to physical disruption, to rapid transplantation, to material and social deprivations, to divergent loyalties, and to intensified emotional strains. Nor can we disregard the tendency of families and communities alike, in times of stress, to throw over slowly evolved democratic procedures in a panicky retreat to rigid controls, and a blind resort to force. There is no little danger that in meeting the immediate demands of the emergency we may inadvertently sacrifice those very values for which we are called upon to fight.

It was always for hearth and home that men ventured out for new hunting grounds and new pastures. And it was for hearth and home that men laid down their lives when assaulted by invaders or marauders. And now that we are at war, it is the family for which we are fighting. Both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, in stating the war aims after the Atlantic conference, emphasized the family, the home, as a major stake in the war. Every attack on problems of public welfare comes back to the family and its way of life. Every attempt to advance the health and strength of our fighting forces comes back to the health

of the family. The vital problem of morale turns out to be a question of the family and its workings.

We know all this. But we do not all know it very urgently. For we have come to take the family for granted as a matter of course, pretty much as we take the air we breathe for granted. We are not, as a people, continuously concerned about it, having relegated it mostly to the area of private taste or personal preference. The family has in fact lost its former important status in the community, and, for understandable reasons, we do not like to bring its problems before the public. The family has lost status because, as the sociologists have been telling us for a long time, so many of its functions, from the purely mechanical and economic to the more subtle educational and spiritual, have been more and more taken over by specialists and by institutions.

And yet the family, stripped though it may be of so many ancient functions and of the corresponding authorities, remains basic—whatever our national ideals and needs may be. At the fourth decennial White House Conference on Children, held in January 1940, the general theme was "Children in a Democracy." The basic committee, representing all the specialties and groups concerned with "every child" and his welfare, formulated the suggestive phrase: "The Family, the Threshold of Democracy."

This formulation appears especially significant today when we are forced to recognize that "democracy" is vastly more than a form of government, that it is essentially a distinct pattern of life, of human relationships. And it is significant because it affirms so strongly the potency of the family in shaping that democracy which has come to be the fundamental issue of our striving. If we mean democracy, here is our cue. For

unless the family does build democracy there is little chance of achieving it further, little chance indeed of retaining what we already have.

We may not assume, however, that the family is necessarily democratic in its workings, or even consistently so in its purposes. We have inherited an authoritarian tradition, and nearly all our processes are autocratic. Within our own memories the family has been thoroughly dictatorial. We still assume rather generally that it is the duty of parents to "enforce obedience," to compel their children to comply with correct modes of conduct, to coerce them into showing respect for their elders and for those in authority.

The family is nevertheless the cradle of democracy, although it is no less the cradle of any other scheme of life that uses the family to cultivate its peculiar virtues and ideals. The family as such is democratic only in the sense that it cares first and last for the persons who make up the group. Parents care for each child, the members of the group care for one another, as persons—without regard to special merits, to school records, to competitive achievements, to scores in beauty contests. In the family, each person counts just because he is a person. However autocratic the family may be in its actual government, it contributes to the cultivation of democratic citizens just because it is concerned with individuals. And that is important even if the family is capable also of cultivating slaves—or masters. It is important because whatever it is we want in the nation must first have its roots in the family, must first be made to operate actively in the family.

We have generally recognized the need, in the present emergency, to protect the comfort and health of the family and its members. Vastly more significant, however, in relation to our war efforts, is what the family

does to its members. For this is a war for the preservation and extension of human rights to the ultimate individual, whoever or wherever he may be. And it is the family that determines how far we are going to respect the individual as a person, without qualifications as to race or religion, without bias as to status or power. For the family begins by treating the child as a person—the very infant in the cradle—without waiting until he can assert himself and show that he can hold his own.

An observant pediatrician, Dr. C. Anderson Aldrich of Chicago, indicates out of his very wide experience how infants differ from the moment of birth. Most newborn babies, for example, submit to being tightly wrapped up in blankets by the nurses. But about one in ten protests against having his legs straightened out in the process. Dr. Aldrich knows that babies have to be tended and covered; but thinks it important for parents and doctors and nurses to respect that one infant's protest, his individual preferences—his right to be different. This is of course a trivial illustration of individuality: but it points straight to the heart of the democracy for which we expect the family to prepare its members. For from the beginning each individual is unique in a multitude of trifles which, so far as anybody can see from the outside, are of no moment whatever. Our democracy is tested by the manner in which we treat individual differences in appearance or sensitivity or preference, for it is in this that our underlying attitudes are continuously and unconsciously revealed.

We have been moving toward more democratic relationships in the home. We have tried—clumsily—to liberate the child from his social disadvantages as a "small" person. At home, the helpless child stands on

his claims as a human being. Like other members of the family, he receives according to his needs—not according to his power, or his merits. And, like other members of the family, he serves according to his ability—which is practically nothing. Fathers and mothers yield to the child, out of affection, or out of consideration. But they come gradually to let him have too much power, and finally make the home itself “child-centered.”

In these ways we have increased respect for the individual, perhaps increased the individual’s self-esteem. And we have made allowance for differences. But we have not necessarily made the home more democratic. For the home normally requires fair concern and consideration for *all* its members, including the father: and it cannot prosper if any individual constantly holds the center—not even if that individual happens to be the child. A change of rulers does not eliminate despotism; a mere removal of restraints does not establish meaningful “freedom.”

We are too often confused by assuming that freedom is somehow incompatible with discipline, that the two are mutually exclusive. But it is not a case of either-or. In every kind of society discipline is necessary. The child has to be protected against dangers, including his own impulses. He cannot be allowed to grasp whatever catches his eye, or to eat whatever he grasps. But we have to develop modes of discipline that will effectively prepare the individual for freedom—in a society of other individuals who are also free. This is possible, but difficult: for none of the traditional patterns of group living has consistently considered both aspects of human relationships.

The child learns but slowly to harmonize the outer demands and restraints with his inner feelings. A little boy who overheard his elders at table use the word

"co-operate" volunteered the information that he knew what "that word" meant. "What does it mean, Johnny?" the father asked. "It means," said the boy, "'you gotta do it.'" That raised eyebrows and further questioning. Johnny explained: "In school, when a fellah doesn't do what he is supposed to, the teacher looks at him and says, 'You're not co-operating.' Then you gotta do it."

So far as the child is concerned, he understands that a degree of conformity or "co-operation" is necessary. So far as the parents and teachers are concerned, however, it matters a great deal what methods they use to insure their goal. This is illustrated by the use we make of obedience. So often we over simplify our task by making conformity and compliance ends in themselves. We make of obedience an ultimate virtue, instead of using our authority and our ability to get obedience as means for helping the child attain his individual adjustment and self-direction in a democratic society.

To administer the home or any group so as to insure each individual full consideration, full protection of his rights, is difficult at best. In the best of homes the members make unreasonable demands upon one another, and conflicting demands upon the common resources. In the family there will always be the need to make personal adjustments and compromises—even if we can get for each one his own radio that nobody else can hear. But it is only in an atmosphere of mutual respect and consideration that the child becomes progressively more socialized and responsible, and at the same time more distinctly his own unique self. And only so can he come to live decently—and democratically—with all kinds of others. But to manage all this takes more thought and more self-restraints and

more imagination than the orderly prescribing and enforcing of rules.

If we cling to the goals of democracy, we must develop types of guidance and training that make possible initiative, free inquiry, experimental reconsideration of old usages and traditions, growth toward self-determination and responsibility. That precludes drilling children and habituating them in standard patterns presumed to meet all situations in life. It precludes rigid and uniform procedures effective in training animals, whether for domestic convenience or for circus performances. It means treating the individual from the first as a unique personality growing toward freedom—that is, treating the individual in ways that are characteristically those of the family.

And it is here that we must be perfectly sure of our goals, and have abiding faith in the efficacy of our means. For democracy is the most difficult undertaking in the history of man. There will be failures and blunders. There will be many discouragements. There will be many temptations to give up, to take the easier or seemingly shorter road—the ancient and established way. Today especially are our tentative and groping experiments challenged by the sudden need to meet the rigorous demands of war. Is our concern for the individual too sentimental? Are our homes too indulgent and debilitating? Are our people becoming too soft? Is it not necessary, in the emergency, to recapture the old virtues by returning to the old methods? These are the very doubts that have been raised about all aspects of democracy. And the last question is pressed most frequently.

If anyone, however, is seriously in doubt as to the effectiveness of educational methods based on “modern”

psychological ideas, there is a practical demonstration right before us. For Hitler has put his scientists to work not alone for mechanizing the army equipment and amplifying the power of his explosives, but also for improving the management of people and their emotions. The army training has definitely taken into account individual differences and the emotional need of the individual to be recognized and accepted as a distinct personality.

In addition to the indispensable drilling and regimenting and order, the German army of today presents an amazing relaxation of the traditional arrogance and severity of the officers, with a corresponding elimination of the subservience of the privates. There is a degree of consideration and patience in educating the men that would have been unthinkable a decade ago. Officers are instructed to deal humanely and considerately with the men—not in a spirit of generous condescension or patronage, but in the determination to make the individual soldier feel his worth and dignity as a member of an exalted calling. The men are to be encouraged to cultivate a sense of personal aspiration and social equality. The stiff saluting and obsequious scraping of a menial are not becoming in our corps of world leaders, world conquerors.

"Share cigarettes with the men; smoke and chat with them; give them friendly personal advice whenever possible. Consult the men on all occasions, even on military plans. Never humiliate a soldier before his companions. Correct his errors as you would those of an equal." The individual is encouraged to feel that promotion lies ahead not only on the basis of his fitting into the routine and his mastery of techniques, but also on his initiative and distinctive qualities.

Our own army, too, has found it necessary to revise

its practices. The traditional military pattern of training fails to fit the war needs of today—just as we had suspected that it would not serve the mental outlooks and adjustments necessary for modern living. Modern war conditions call for more initiative on the part of the individual soldier, who is often left to his own resources. They require of him a better understanding of the plans and objectives of the unit of which he is a part. "Intelligent co-operation" is considered a prime essential. But that cannot be attained through the old-fashioned courses in bawling the soldier out. On the contrary, our officers are being instructed in the need to "preserve the men's self-respect."

It is then possible under military conditions to take account of individual differences and to give thought to the individual's needs for self-esteem and for the respect of others. The family should therefore be more confident that its own distinctive procedures, which respect everybody's personality, even the baby's, can effectively develop responsibility, intelligent co-operation and self-discipline. And if we consider freedom and opportunity for all persons important, we can achieve the needed discipline only with the active and conscious co-operation of the family, in which these aims are pre-eminent.

The family remains in any case inseparable from public policy. The totalitarian leaders draw upon the family to serve *them* rather than its own members. The family in Germany and in Italy is obliged not only, as in Sparta, to send its children at a tender age to the training master; but it is obliged to care for the young child and to direct his development strictly in accord with prescribed rules calculated to set the individual's bias and preferences precisely as those in power wish to have them. Eventually the state takes the family over,

as it takes the schools and the press and what passes for religion. And the family supplies the state precisely the kind of citizens the state demands.

We must not be deceived by the apparent "humanizing" of the military organization. This may be but a more effective way of building up group consciousness and joint action. Where a basic tenet of a whole culture rests on the assumption of racial superiority, the cohesiveness and unity may be but those of the gang. In the authoritarian countries the soldiers are not expected to be decent or considerate to others. The dictatorships continue to wreak their malevolence and their brutal coercions upon all the submerged and subordinated. For they recognize only two classes—"our own people" and all others—and for their purposes the traditional training and disciplinary methods are adequate.

Does democracy mean to us something as important as does the state to the Germans of the moment, or as does the Son of the Sun to the Nipponese? Then it must mean something different, something much more subtle and intangible. We start out with faith in common people—all people. We assume ultimate values in the individual person—every person. We thus immediately reduce the state and all other institutions to the rank of instruments, of means for serving human beings. We therefore cannot follow those efficient forms and procedures that belittle or ignore persons and exalt the instruments—methods that convert persons into instruments. There is involved more than "good techniques." Democracy must be so clear and so convinced as to its goals that it can never be confused and diverted by glittering promises of short cuts leading to the abyss.

So we are forced again to look seriously to the fam-

ily, which is in any case the source of the future men and women, and to ask ourselves what we want of it. Is it merely to supply the statistical units for armies or industries or markets—to serve others, as in some economic or political slavery? Or is the family to produce the human beings who are to give substance and meaning to our civilization? Pointing to effective techniques for getting discipline, which is necessary for order, cannot answer the question of insuring freedom, which is equally necessary for the kind of civilization we intend.

Nothing reveals more clearly our national commitment to freedom than the remarkable development of schooling and of other services for "the child." This represents the readiness of fathers and mothers to strive and to sacrifice jointly for all the children of all the people. We have come pretty generally to recognize some of the undesirable outcomes of overprotecting children, especially in the later years. We know that we have so sheltered children that in many cases they are kept away from every chance to find out what life is, to find out what they themselves are, to try out their capacities and limitations, to discover their essential needs. This entire development, however, with all its shortcomings and blunders, is a clear gain for democracy, and must not be abandoned in a panic.

Today, without relaxing in any of the essential activities and agencies for the health and well-being and education of children, we have to give much more attention to the deeper needs of the individual as a person. We must continue to guard the standards for child care and protection attained in the past fifty years, and advance them further. We know the health hazards of children at work, we know the dangers to the whole community of exploiting young people in industry. But we must not feel that we have to choose between suit-

able protection and the equal need of young people to share emotionally and creatively in the useful work of their communities. To share in the important activities and concerns of their elders is quite as necessary for the boys and girls growing toward adulthood as anything that schools and homes can teach them. It is neither fair to them nor good sense socially to make them forfeit work and responsibility because we older people had not yet learned to manage our affairs without injury to youth.

A common example of carrying excessive protection to the point of privation is the effort of parents to keep from their children an acquaintance with money, while they themselves are constantly worried over it. They thus force their children, without meaning to, of course, to share their worries, but do not help them to a clear understanding of what is involved. Here, as in so many cases, we may successfully hide the sources of our trouble, while leaving the strains and anxieties open for the children to absorb—to share, but without a chance to share in thinking and doing anything.

Children resent being excluded from family troubles. An illuminating case is furnished by a twelve-year-old girl who had been sent away from home for a few weeks in order to shield her from knowledge of her grandmother's death and from the pain and sorrow attending the funeral. Aside from the question of what a girl of twelve may be expected to face, and aside from the necessity of her facing this particular fact sooner or later, this girl was exposed to something more painful and disturbing than facing the reality of death. She felt herself being pushed away from matters of manifest concern to the rest of the family. Unless she was a complete moron, she must have sensed her parents' distress. She must have been disturbed by the secrecy

which left her imagination free to invent endlessly fantastic explanations of the great trouble. And it must have depressed her self-esteem to be excluded from what was obviously of great importance to the family.

In every family the father and mother must be, as a woman once said, to a degree "combatable" in their relations. But for the sake of the children we maintain a surface appearance of calm while squirming internally. The excessive restraint under irritations, the affected unconcern while worried by the bills that cannot be paid or by dilemmas that cannot be solved, we may justify as good form, or as necessary self-control. We attempt to do the almost impossible in order to protect the children from disagreeable experiences. Few adults seem to realize that the vague, nameless undercurrents of feeling disturb children more than would an open and heated discussion with a blowing off of steam, or a frank consideration of the many day-to-day problems.

Children constantly need help from their elders in interpreting the differences among people, especially as these take on sharply defined political or theological forms. And parents themselves often need help, so that they can meet the frequently baffling situations that arise at home. When the parents differ, for example, on a wise procedure, one or the other will have to make it clear to the child that father and mother can differ never so much and yet work solidly together toward the same common ends of helping each child to become a decent and self-respecting person. Or to explain that they can disagree and still have no less affection. It is in these experiences that the child is helped toward being able and willing to live with others on the same basis.

The war has intensified many of these problems for families everywhere. Children lack of course the ex-

perience and the maturity to understand what is going on beyond their immediate concerns. They can continue to play around the craters left by bombs, and they find the wreckage and rubble rather interesting to play with. For the young child, the entire world is circumscribed by his home and school, his nursery and playground. These children are nevertheless not immune to the war or to its demoralizations. For they absorb the moods of their elders without being able to make sense out of the incomprehensible behavior of those around them. We want to spare the children the harrowing thoughts and anxieties which we feel, and so we end by shielding them completely from all that goes on.

Children have a deep need for help in keeping their own balance and sanity in the atmosphere of emotional and spiritual conflicts. But the balance comes from the support which they feel behind them when confronted by staggering events or privations. The child's anxieties can best be met with the help of the adult's courage. If adults get into panic, the children will do no better. We can give our children security not by hiding them from life but by helping them feel our support, our confidence, our faith in the endurance over time of what we cherish and strive for.

Here it will not be enough to tell parents to be brave, or urge them to be cheerful. There will be needed a tremendous amount of direct work with adults as well as with children to make use of our best insights in counseling, and of our best techniques in organizing the practical work in which we shall all have to share.

In our anxiety to protect children from all hurts, we have attempted—and of course without success—to establish homes free of all conflict. But conflict is inseparable from living. It is not conflict that hurts the child. The child is hurt when we use disagreements to

disparage or belittle the others. The child is confused and torn by this process, for it pulls at his loyalties and forces him to try impossible reconciliations of his personal attachments. How can he continue to love both father and mother when each in turn makes him feel that there is so much weakness or folly or even something reprehensible in the other? He wants to love and regard both parents, in spite of their many differences: but too often he is made to feel that he cannot be loyal to one if he accepts the other wholeheartedly. And this applies of course to other members of the family.

It is one of the distinctive qualities of the family that within it persons who care for one another can differ endlessly in their opinions, and can manifest their differences with force, and yet continue to care for one another and to respect one another. The mothers and fathers have to help children understand that not only do people differ in every way, but that self-assertion and discussion and controversy are of the very essence of democratic living. One of the most important things the child can learn from the family is that the only acceptable and workable alternative to authoritarianism, for people who would be free, is this very process of differing and respecting the others with their differences. If the child can experience this process at home day by day and absorb its implications, he will have the best possible preparation for democratic living.

The final consequence of our child-centered solicitude has been the neglect of adult men and women, who have never had time to catch up with the hopes which their parents once held out for them. We seem in need of learning anew that parents are also people. It is only by living their own lives as men and women that parents can hope to grow along with the changing world—and with their children. And only as fathers and mothers

grow can they help their children grow into that world which is bound to be different from that which they knew in their childhood.

Parents have been so closely confined to their work, their homes, their routine pastimes, that many of their needs were being systematically looked after *for* them. Many fathers and mothers vaguely feel the need to share more actively in the vital affairs of their community and of their culture; but they increasingly find such sharing to be extremely difficult, if not impossible.

But the special difficulties in the family reflect a general condition, for our generation is called upon to deal with an old problem on a vaster scale than was ever before necessary. We are asked not only to stand firmly for what we consider important, but we are asked at the same time to respect those who do not agree with us! In the past, when everybody, within his own area of experience, knew just exactly what was right—and knew that all who did not agree were wrong—it was comparatively easy to stand firm. But the test which democracy imposes upon us is to have our convictions and yet respect those others—equally able, equally intelligent, equally conscientious and high-minded—who differ from us.

If all this does not come easy, we must guard against feeling guilty or defeated. This is a new task, for a new era in history. Our nation is still very young, and we have not yet learned all we need to master for carrying on what democracy demands of us. And we certainly have not yet learned how to guide our children in these terms. But we shall have to learn, for these conditions are essential to our ultimate success, to the victory of democracy, both at home and in the war.

It is certain attitudes of people that together make

up the inner aspect of what we mean by democracy. They reveal themselves not in formal pronouncements or rituals, but in countless trivial acts and responses to daily situations. And the absence of genuine democratic feeling and conviction equally shows itself unconsciously and casually. We all recognize certain pervasive prejudices and antagonisms. These suspicions and hostilities divide us and obstruct any large undertaking for the common welfare. Whether we are explicitly taught—as are the “Aryans”—that *we* are the chosen people, or merely take it for granted because we are afraid of strangers, we shall have to broaden our conception of democracy.

The war must in the nature of things impose upon us an unaccustomed unity. It will teach millions of people that they really belong in this country. They will have their sons in the army, along with sons of families whose names are known to be “American.” And the womenfolks will be employed in war industries. The home folks will rub shoulders with other volunteers and with air wardens. They will join with others in community sings, and will be addressed by the speakers, along with the neighbors up the hill whom they never knew, as ladies and gentlemen, or as fellow citizens.

We may all learn, when we are thus thrown together, and in spite of some initial irritations, that all those others are very much the same kind of people, and Americans all. Already the attempts to develop community organization and some of the essential services in the mushroomed towns of the war industries and training camps have brought new problems. In some cases, the effectiveness of the war effort has been impeded by the inhospitable reception which the transplanted families experienced in these communities. It

will take much more than routine management to relax in such situations the prevailing fear of strangers and of hostility toward them.

In a recent piece in his department "One Man's Meat" in *Harper's Magazine*, E. B. White tells of the civilian defense activities in a New England town. While all the preparations were being made to catch the invader in the sky, "the enemy slipped into town and out again," and hardly a dozen knew he was there—or could recognize him when he stood before their very eyes. For the enemy, says Mr. White, came in the guise of what many considered a harmless Halloween prank, in which the town boys (not the hoodlums) piled up hen coops and odds and ends of rubbish before the shop of a Jewish merchant, and hung his effigy in the elm tree with a warning to all and sundry not to deal with this symbol of the unaccepted minority. . . . "People got ready," Mr. White continues "to attend the defense meeting . . . volunteer to save democracy . . . motor corps . . . surgical dressings. The enemy had disappeared, virtually unnoticed, and all that remained were the fame of his European successes and the shadow of distant wings. Only a few people had felt his hot breath in the branches of the elm. . . . There would never be a moment, in war or in peace, when I wouldn't trade all the patriots in the country for one tolerant man. Or when I wouldn't swap the vitamins in a child's lunchbox for a jellyglass of magnanimity."

Surely we need not in this country and at this time choose between being patriotic and accepting on an equal footing all people, with all their differences. And surely we must recognize with Mr. White that it is not we but the enemy who would arrogantly strike down the generous spirit—which is of the essence of

democracy. At all events, when we undertake to extend democracy to the whole world, we have to be perfectly clear as to its implications for all the different groups and colors and nationalities and religions.

The need to protect and preserve the family will demand effort and thought. It will challenge the individual members of every family, who will have to know what is at stake for themselves and for civilization and who will know what they must demand of the community and of the various agencies and institutions. The need will challenge all the agencies that work with families, both voluntary and official. They will need to know what their obligations and justifications are, as well as their ways and means.

There will be difficulties. There will be lack of funds and of personnel and of materials. There will be opposition from various sources—from people eager to get on with the war, impatient of “non-essentials” or of things that might be deferred. We will be reminded that we must put “first things first” and let other things wait. But to serve the men and women and children who make up the families of the nation, wherever the individuals happen at the time to be, whatever they happen at the time to be doing, is not to divert any forces or resources from the fighting front. On the contrary, it will mean tapping new energies and talents, mining new resources that had been idle—and that will reinforce the nation’s fighting strength.

For what is necessary is something to make every last individual feel that this is his or her war, that the outcome is of supreme importance and must take precedence over everything else. This means men and women and children enlisted to find out what all the shooting is about—not content to give dutiful approval to leaders and officials. It is only as we all do care

enough to try to find out that our emotions and intellects can be harnessed to the common purpose. It means all enlisted to do what needs to be done—as in an emergency.

The war will compel us, even more than did ten years of economic depression, to extend health and social services on a vast scale. Eventually we must discover that our numerous welfare and service agencies of all kinds, including religious organizations, can accomplish their excellent purposes not by intensifying their efforts or refining their techniques, but by getting those they seek to help to join them in a vast common enterprise that includes all of us. The family must come to take an active part in the working of our community and cultural resources, instead of being left to accept passively what the specialists have to offer them for the good of its members.

The eagerness with which men and women of ability, as well as those of minor equipment, have volunteered their services indicates not only the great inner need which these individuals feel to join with their fellows in this world-wide struggle, but also the tremendous amount of unused intelligence and skill and working power which is in fact currently diverted into wasteful or merely indifferent and perfunctory operations.

We have to win every battle on the home front as a condition of victory in the war. And out of this all-out war to rid the world of aggressors and to establish human rights for all people, we can win the peace only if we recognize that democracy and the good life begin in the family—in respect for persons.

THE HOME FRONT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

by

Paul V. McNutt

THERE must be hundreds of thousands of children in the world today who do not know the meaning of peace—babies who have been born into families distraught by war; children too young to remember very much before the bombs began to fall; boys and girls who have forgotten what it was like not to be at least a little hungry and a little cold.

For more than two years now, half the civilized world has been compelled to sacrifice most of the values we believe should be part of home and family life—sacrifice them to the all-consuming destruction let loose by armed aggression. For more than a year and a half we ourselves had been preparing to defend our homes against that threat; now we are completely and irrevocably engaged to repel the aggressors and to destroy such aggression as a menace to mankind.

Whatever differences there may have been among us as to wise national policy when the aggression seemed to some the concern of other people, we are now united in the solemn determination to see this job through, confident that with our efforts there will be established a world of orderly peace, according to the collective conscience of all the people.

Even before any air-raid siren had sounded on this continent, we had learned that we cannot go back to

where we were two years ago. A million and a half men under arms, and more millions coming. Millions massed on all the industrial lines of defense. Families uprooted. Boom towns created where a year ago there were cornfields. A great and an increasing share of our national resources and of our continuous production devoted to the extraordinary demands of this day and hour. No, business cannot go on as usual. The family cannot continue its routines as usual. The emergency is immediate. The challenge must be met, is being met, on every front. This world war is not being fought on the line of battle alone, but in every dimension of life—the economic and industrial, educational and propaganda, medical and sanitary, agricultural and transportation—and not the least, the domestic. Here are just a handful of those who already have learned at first hand what today's emergency means:

The farmer whose pasture accommodates twenty-three trailers, and the close to a hundred men, women and children—powder plant workers and their families—who live in this temporary "slum on wheels."

The county sheriff who, raiding a disreputable tavern, picked up several local farm girls all under sixteen—they'd come into the camp town looking for regular work—and found in "the oldest profession in the world" the only jobs where their youth was no bar to employment.

The trucker who hauls drinking water twelve miles to a squatter settlement near a new defense plant—and the families that must depend on this meager supply until the city pipe line catches up with them.

The manufacturer who is working against time to switch from lingerie lace to army mosquito net—and the employees who will be out of work during the

transformation, and indefinitely if the metamorphosis should fail.

The small town furniture dealer who bedded down overflow soldiers on all his fine new mattresses, after the maneuver invasion had exhausted the open-house sleeping quarters of every home, tourist camp and hotel.

These incidents are important not because they are extraordinary, but because they are matter of course. Things like this are part of the day's work to thousands upon thousands of Americans and their families.

The upheaval which many thought *could* not happen here *has* happened here. And it goes right on happening and reaching out to broaden and tighten its grasp—not just at our pocketbooks through mounting taxes and rising food costs, but also at the whole pattern of our family lives.

In a crisis, a nation, like any sensible family, has to decide for itself what it can do without, temporarily, and what it must preserve at all costs. The main lines of this decision were pretty clear since the start of the defense program: There never has been any question that the health and welfare of *all* the people are essential to defense. There never had been any question that we would utilize and strengthen *all* the machinery of our democratic government to help safeguard them. And there never had been any question that this is a joint responsibility in which the nation, its communities, and its citizens all have a stake.

The Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services was set up to implement these convictions. Its task is to build a national framework through which all our resources—national and local, public and private—can be mobilized on broad sectors of the home front. Since

November 1940, we have been working at this job—in recreation, education, social protection, public health, nutrition, family security, and child care.

Naturally our first concern was to come to the support of hard-pressed defense areas—to apply the “good neighbor policy” among ourselves. When a town of, say a thousand or so, suddenly finds an army post of forty or fifty thousand camping on its doorstep, we help out—just as you would help your neighbors in a similar domestic crisis. There are several hundred of these towns—where soldiers and sailors pour in on leave, where civilian population has mushroomed overnight. They have been short of almost everything. Housing, hospitals, schools, play space and equipment, water supply, sanitation, traffic control, fire and police protection—all these familiar facilities of “community housekeeping” have been burdened beyond capacity.

But the need in these towns has been not merely for *things* and for skilled services. It has also been for *good will*—to put up with discomfort, to welcome strangers, and to make them a part of the community. By and large, the response is heartening—and heart-warming. Federal agencies—all the twenty and more co-operating in the defense health and welfare program—have given and are giving all possible help. The States have added their full support and voluntary organizations have joined forces, as, for example, through the United Service Organizations. But when all is said and done, the home-town job is being done by the home-town folks: Grange halls, church parlors, courthouse squares, school gyms, and playing fields, local swimming holes, vacant stores, family living rooms—and even family bathtubs—have been pieced into a pattern of real community hospitality. It is a patchwork affair in many places; but it is a going concern. This is not to

imply of course that everything is rosy; but it is fair to say that this chapter of our current history is full of genuine human interest—of potential hazards overcome by salty common sense, practical ingenuity, and plain human kindness. The benefit has been mutual. It is not too much to say of the men in uniform and of their hosts that this welcome “blesseth him that gives and him that takes.”

But this is more—much more—than just a good story. In its difficulties and in its successes, it is a demonstration of democracy at work. It is a demonstration of the kind of community teamwork that will get on top of any job—once we wake up to the fact that there is a job to be done. And what was done by community teamwork depended upon local initiative, local ingenuity, and spontaneous co-operation, rather than upon a unified scheme prescribed and ordered from headquarters. The result is that several hundred distinct patterns of adjustment are meeting the emergency—with a closer regard to the actual needs of the people concerned, with a fuller utilization of local resources. These community efforts are actuated by the same common purpose, are all guided by the realism and common sense of our pioneers. This experience suggests the kind of efficiency and adaptability that distinguish the democratic way of dealing with a crisis.

It did not take long to see that something had to be done for a million and a half men, most of them young, many of them away from home for the first time, and thrown suddenly into the strange and stringent life of barracks, kitchen police, and field maneuvers. It has taken longer to realize that for the army in overalls, life is at least as uprooted, and even more complicated.

This is not merely because there are many times more people on the production line than in the military

service, and that more of them have families. The men in the army and in the training camps have much of their routine planned for them and prescribed. The civilians, by contrast, are nominally free to come and go as they like, and to live pretty much their own lives. Yet, in these rapidly expanded industrial and accessory communities they are not able to use their free time and their pocket money in the accustomed ways. The whole familiar pattern of coming and going is completely distorted, for the family as well as for the individual, quite apart from the question of money to spend.

In spite of relatively good wages, most of these people do not draw munificent pay—the average is about \$140 a month. The worker in the munitions and supply industries, who must take care of his family on this income, is, to say the least, not much better off than the army private—whose \$21 a month is backed up by the “all expenses found” support of military service.

The first headache for the family of the industrial worker is to get a roof over their heads. In the boom towns rents have skyrocketed, and they may secure a room or two for about forty or fifty dollars a month—with luck. Beds, like machines, are being used in three shifts in more than one town. With food prices up, fifty dollars a month provides only bare necessities for a family of four. Add in transportation, clothes, doctor's bills, and the inevitable odds and ends, and the industrial worker's family has very little left out of \$140 a month.

Even if they have some money for recreation, where can they go? Factories work around the clock, and men and women have their free time at awkward hours. Some war industries are in country villages as overcrowded as any army camp town. Others are in cities which at first sometimes felt that the place for these

strangers brought in by defense was, literally and figuratively, "on the other side of the tracks." Movies and restaurants are not content merely to hang out "standing room only" signs; they close their doors when the crowd gets too thick. Gambling joints, drinking places, and dance halls do a land-office business.

Schools are overtaxed. Kindergartens are being discontinued and elementary and high school classes run in two shifts. Teachers are difficult to obtain because there is no place to house them. Many women are working along with their husbands. Children are left to shift for themselves—four children under six years fell into a river and were almost drowned a few weeks ago. There has been a marked increase in juvenile delinquency among adolescent boys and girls. These are just *some* of the facts.

The home folks in industrial towns are beginning to see that this is their problem too; they are opening their doors to the newcomers. One town whose population has increased about 200 per cent has, for example, set up eight neighborhood clubs. Every one of these is filled to capacity twenty-four hours a day, as people come off their shifts in the defense plant. School shortages are also being met—somehow. More schools are being built at strategic spots, with Federal help, where necessary. Meantime emergency quarters are found. One small industrial city housed overflow children in a vacant store—school books and supplies were made to do double duty. The town's undertakers provided chairs. Its hardware dealers, coat hooks and paint to turn one wall into a blackboard. Its fuel dealers, coal; and across the street the "Keep off the grass" signs came out of the town square to make way for a playground.

These "hot spots" near vast military posts and giant new defense industries are the beginning—but not the

end—of the home front. True, the men in military service are the spearhead of our defense effort, and as such deserve special consideration. Say ten times as many civilians are directly employed in defense industries. Large as this number is, it represents only a fraction of the whole American people. The others are “just folks”—the backbone of the nation. And they also serve. Their strength, their health, their sense of community solidarity—of having a part in this all-out national endeavor—are fully as important as the strength and health and courage of those who man the military and industrial lines. It is a practical and immediate essential even if we think of this war only in military terms.

The experience of Germany toward the end and after World War I, the experience of France during the appalling spring of 1940, prove that an army, no matter how well equipped, is no stronger than the people behind the lines.

In the words of Marshal Pétain: “The spirit of sacrifice has been absent from France. This, too, played a part in French defeat, and perhaps that is, for us, the most important lesson of all.”

United—total—strength for all the nation is one reason, and a valid one, for making civilian health and welfare a part of the public and official concern of a nation at war. But it is not the only reason, or perhaps in the long run even the most important reason. Without attempting in any way to minimize the desperate urgency of all-out military protection, I want to stress the long-time and continuing urgency of maintaining and strengthening the fabric of family and community life.

There are tremendous potential assets as well as liabilities, in our present situation. One change, which may

already be set down on the credit side of the ledger, is a quickened awareness of long-standing needs. Emergency is an imperative eye opener. It will not tolerate a do-nothing policy.

Protection against venereal diseases and commercial prostitution—and the vicious or slipshod conditions which permit or foster these ills—is a case in point. Every community in the country pays lip service to the obligation to safeguard youth against these hazards; in too many communities responsibility stopped there—until emergency aggravated this risk. For years, we have known that there were social and economic, as well as medical and legal, angles on the prostitution problem. One enlightened city has, for example, reported that more than 90 per cent of the girls who become “police problems” come from homes that lack the money to bring up their children as all American parents want to.

Now, at last, all over the country we are attempting to back up essential legal and medical protection with equally essential *social* protection. Legal repression of commercial prostitution and facilities for detention and rehabilitation are important; but these are not enough. Adequate and accessible medical provision for both prevention and treatment is necessary; but that too is not enough. Beyond these, young people, both boys and girls, have a right to some solid foundation on which to build their own lives—wholesome homes, free from the corrosion of fear and abject want; training for jobs and a chance to get jobs; opportunity for the fun and adventure that is part of youth in ways that deepen, rather than destroy, the values and satisfactions of awakening maturity. This is a part of the national purpose, now and for the future—a part to which every parent will give his full support.

Present stresses and strains weigh heavily on young people—but not on them alone. We have learned to look for the repercussions of change even among those who seem most remote from the mainstream of defense: Speed up the wheels of industry—and a third of a million children are left without schools. Create new defense jobs, and living costs soar beyond the meager assistance budgets of the needy aged and the handicapped. Even families to whom the upsurge of war activity offers promise of increased economic security may end in tragedy. Here is one case:

The father, fifty-odd and a skilled mechanic, had weathered the depression by running a one-man garage. When defense industry called all workers, he was quickly hired for a job some 400 miles away in another state. His good wages justified taking his wife and two boys along—though moving used up most of their small savings. The job, he found, took a lot out of him; he still had his old skill, but the shop was hot and the pace fast. Even when he caught cold, he wouldn't stay home—for fear they'd think he was "too old to take it." Late one night he became so ill that his wife grew desperate. None of the neighbors knew about doctors; they too were strangers in town. The only place to turn for help seemed to be the city hospital. A neighbor offered his car. But when they reached the hospital after midnight there were no empty beds—even the cots in the hall were full. Before morning pneumonia had claimed another victim. The neighbors were kind and the plant paid the widow a month's extra wages. But the family couldn't live long on that. The public welfare office was genuinely concerned but—there were "buts" to stop every hope: The father hadn't any Federal survivors' insurance because in his garage business he had been "self-employed." General relief and aid

to dependent children were inaccessible—for the first, the community had no money; for the second, the no-man's land of state legal-settlement laws raised impassable barriers. Finally a place was made for this mother in the kitchen of a home for children. The two boys may have to live in an orphanage, but at least they are near their mother.

That is what the mere shadow of war had done to just one family—but for hundreds of others the experience of disaster differs only in degree. Add to migration and the hazards of often physically dangerous war industries, the very real possibility that shortages and priorities may create a new kind of spot depression in the midst of capacity production. We cannot dodge this problem; it affects every town and, indeed, every family in the country.

The pressure for supplies and munitions compels us to broaden our protections for the security of families and children. Certainly no one who realizes the extent of our military requirements can doubt the genuine urgency for some such extension of social security legislation as the President suggested but a few weeks before we entered the war officially. But related as this is to our war effort, it is not alone a national responsibility. It is also a state and local responsibility. And the crisis places an obligation on every single one of us to see that no family be allowed to break up for want of the material essentials for healthy living—which we have fortunately in abundance, but have to place where they will best serve.

Everything that has been said of these long-standing lacks and present needs applies also to health. Those in charge of the hospital just referred to as having turned away a man whose life might have been saved were not incompetent or callous. The hospital was desperately

overloaded—its never adequate facilities and staff completely swamped by the defense influx.

For years, we have worried along without anything like adequate safeguards for health. The United States Public Health Service, state public health departments, and other organizations have made tremendous contributions to health protection. But the people themselves have failed to keep pace with them. We have put up with the faultiest kind of distribution in this basic service—dangerous shortages of doctors, nurses, hospitals, and clinics in many parts of the country, while in some few places the field was so overcrowded as to result in cut-throat competition.

With Federal help, more hospital beds and other facilities are being provided in the communities that have been hardest pressed. Plans are being worked out to spread available medical supplies and medical care for the people at home, as well as for the men in camp. The Federal government is providing funds so that hospitals and schools can enlist and train 50,000 young women for professional nursing. And a corps of trained volunteer nurses aides is being built up to conserve skilled nursing care for the tasks in which it is most needed. As a result of our increasing concern we have been developing a program of nationwide health protection which would at least pool the financial risk and spread the cost through the mechanisms of social insurance.

We shall make up our arrears. But it will take time—time that grows shorter every day. Meanwhile health cannot wait. And we, all of us, need not wait for one basic means of improving the health of our own families and of the nation. Food conservation—"Food for Freedom"—is a number-one item in the war program. Food use for health is a number-one item not only for

the duration of the war, but for all the time—for all the people.

During the last ten years, so the National Research Council tells me, more progress has been made in the science of nutrition than at any time in the past. Yet with all this knowledge and with the greatest food resources in the world, we are not well fed. The results of the medical examinations for the Selective Service leave no doubt of that: out of the first million men examined, 150,000 were found unfit for military service because of physical disabilities, due directly or indirectly to malnutrition. These were the children of a generation ago. What of the children of today?

Utilizing food to improve health is a national responsibility. It involves nationwide production, processing, distribution, buying power and consumer education. But it is one kind of problem in farming communities and another kind of problem in cities where "grow your own food" is either a joke or an insult. And in both town and country it is completely *local* in its application; three meals a day happen where people *are*—whether at the family table or in a one-arm quick lunch.

Every state in the Union has a nutrition committee tied in with its State Defense Council. And many local communities are at work to combat the ignorance and poverty that underscore this need. Free school lunches, the food-stamp plan and low-cost milk schemes have proved their value wherever they have been tried out. They are being extended, strengthened, redoubled. But malnutrition is not wholly an economic problem, nor are ignorance and apathy confined to the so-called under-privileged. We can all of us improve our practice. Parent educators have been advising not only on nutrition of children, but on the perhaps no less important

problems of eating habits. It seems appropriate to suggest that the eating habits of adults might also profit from such expert assistance.

Federal agencies stand ready—the Department of Agriculture, the Consumers' Division of the Office for Emergency Management, and our own Division of Nutrition, and its National Nutrition Advisory Committee. They are there to help. But the job itself rests with the men and women of the nation in their homes and in their communities.

This is true all along the line. For all of us, personal responsibilities are intensified by present pressures. But they must not be ingrowing. The national emergency demands that our concern expand in ever-widening circles—to our neighbors, our communities, and the whole nation. People are always ready to pull together in a crisis. Out of the solidarity and unity of purpose to which the present crisis has swiftly aroused the entire nation, we may well draw lasting assets. More and more people are learning from their stirring experience that teamwork is the only way to handle the tremendous job with which we are confronted. Let us hope that through this common struggle sincere co-operation of citizens and government will become a permanent part of the American habit.

Certainly we are rediscovering today that the responsibility of being an American citizen cannot be delegated. There is work for all, and all over the country people are eagerly looking for the spot where their individual services will count for most.

Not all volunteer activities make the same kind of appeal. It is one thing to enlist for training as a fire warden or airplane spotter, and quite another to offer one's services in an overcrowded nursery school for the children of defense workers, or in an understaffed city

health clinic. Civilian co-operation in protection against outright enemy attack has a tremendous dramatic pull—but that fact does not make it any less necessary. The reverse is equally true: many of the things that we have come to take for granted are more important than ever, and what they lack on the spectacular side is more than compensated on the side of service. And the same thing is true of the contribution that all of us make to national defense within the four walls of home.

Over and over again we have assured each other that “the family is the foundation of our society.” Like the line “In God We Trust” on our coins, the words wear thin with usage, and the keen edge of meaning is dulled by time.

What has happened to families in nations that have discarded democracy should have shocked us out of this complacency. The efficiency of dictators sets store by youth to a degree that should give us pause. The methods of dictators—the regimentation of school and work and play, the abasement of family loyalties—set a pattern which we would oppose with all the physical strength and spiritual conviction that we can command.

The life that we have made for ourselves here in this great land is far from perfect. But there is this about it—and about us: we are still free to acknowledge its imperfections, and to work together for its improvement. Our goals are of our own choosing; our methods of our own making. That is democracy. That is the secret of its seeming hesitations and of its abiding strength. That is what we now defend.

Though the days ahead do not look easy, this is no cause for discouragement. It is a matter of record that never in all its history has this country fallen down on a really *hard* job. The times when we may have faltered have been those when we were too dazzled by pros-

perity to look beneath its bright surface. But the *tough* spots—from the conquest of the first frontier and the gaining of our national independence on down—have turned out in retrospect to be the *high* spots—the great strides forward in American progress.

This will be true again. It will be true, not only because we are gathering all our strength for military defense and for industrial armament. It will be true also because the core of our life—which is in our homes and families—remains sound and vital.

Whatever we do, here on the home front, to conserve the health and strength and courage of *all* the people is clear gain, both now and for the future. Whatever we do, now in our own time, to safeguard, to strengthen, and to implement our self-chosen way of life will further fortify this great American stronghold. The world looks to us to withstand the threats that have temporarily eclipsed democracy in so many other nations. And we shall not fail. We shall preserve what we would defend—our homes and families, our civil rights and protections, our opportunities to discharge our personal obligations as American citizens.

.

NUTRITIONAL ASPECT OF PUBLIC MORALE

by

Thomas T. Mackie, M.D.

OF RECENT years, and particularly since the outbreak of the second World War, the science of nutrition has achieved increasing prominence in the lay as well as the medical mind. The term "nutrition" in the last twenty-five or thirty years has undergone significant changes in its connotation. Before the systematic physiological studies got under way during the past century, nutrition was conceived as a rather vague totality of ordinary foods that were known empirically to keep the body in health or working condition. Later, the notion of nutrition came to include the requisite caloric intake, proportional quantities of proteins, carbohydrates and fats and mineral salts that were recognized as essential.

The more modern concept of nutrition had its origins in the early 1920's, with the chemical isolation and identification of a progressively increasing number of specific food factors called the vitamins. This term itself is now known to be a misnomer since by its derivation it implies that these substances contain within their chemical structure certain combinations of nitrogen with hydrogen known as amines. This is now recognized to be incorrect, but for historical reasons the name has been retained.

As the number of these specific dietary factors has

been elaborated by biologists, the chemists have been occupied with the investigating of their functions in the human and other animal bodies. These investigations have yielded much significant information and are responsible for the concept of the process of nutrition which is generally accepted today.

Each individual cell within the human or other animal body operates as a complex chemical factory in which a variety of crude substances, the food molecules, take part in highly complex processes. These yield the energy through which the cell carries on its life, and through which all the organs of the body perform normal functions. And just as the furnace, in translating coal energy into heat and electricity, liberates smoke and gases as the end products, so the metabolizing living cells of the body produce as end products carbon dioxide, water, and the other waste products as well as energy. The waste products are eliminated from the body.

This progressive chemical breakdown of the crude food molecules within the cell depends upon the interaction of classes of substances known as enzymes and co-enzymes. In the absence of either one the chemical reactions essential to life cease. In the absence of an adequate supply of many of the presently known vitamins, the co-enzymes are inactive, and the reactions cease or are incomplete.

When the supply of the specific food factors is markedly restricted over a considerable period of time, there is invariably not only interference with the normal activity of the cell and of the physiologic systems of the body, made up of these individual cells: but also ultimately an actual change in structure takes place. These effects produce on the one hand the symptoms of malnu-

trition, and on the other the signs of actual deficiency disease.

The modern concept of nutrition therefore implies not merely a sufficient supply of calories, of protein, of carbohydrate, of fat, and of essential minerals. It involves likewise a sufficient supply of the vitamins which permit the body to utilize these substances in normal fashion and thereby to remain in a normal state of health.

As this modern knowledge has developed, there has been an increasing volume of investigations into the effects of malnutrition. It is today possible to ascribe to prolonged malnutrition certain very definite effects upon population masses. It has been shown experimentally in animals that malnutrition is associated with definite reduction of normal resistance to various infections. It has been shown among industrial groups that prolonged and significant malnutrition leads to diminished efficiency of the worker, to definite increase in the incidence of industrial accidents, to a definite decrease in general morale with a significant development of neuroses.

During this period in which the current concepts were developed, the newer knowledge has been applied not only to individuals but to population groups; and again certain important observations have been made. For example, it has been shown very definitely that among the inmates of tuberculosis sanatoria, with improvement of the diet and the addition of larger amounts of vitamins, there has been a significant decrease in the incidence of tuberculosis of the intestinal tract.

In Britain, in the last twenty-five years, there has been a marked change in the average diet of the population. The consumption of vitamin-bearing foods has

been increased by approximately 50 per cent and during this period of time there has occurred an expected decrease in the incidence of malnutrition, a reduction of infant mortality rates, a reduction in the death rate from tuberculosis, and a marked improvement in the general health and growth rate of school children. While many factors undoubtedly contributed to the improvement, the change in nutritional practices was probably of prime importance.

The association of famine with pestilence is both ancient and trite. Likewise the statement that an army travels on its stomach has long been well and widely known. Both of these observations, originating many years before the inception of the science of nutrition, represent the sum of empirical knowledge which has been more than amply confirmed as our present-day knowledge has developed. A diet deficient in the specific food factors or in adequate amounts of the proper types of protein, even though it may supply sufficient calories for energy, is inconsistent with good health. Such a diet is consequently inconsistent with the efficiency of either the civil or the military population. The extension of the present war to the entire world with its manifold political, commercial, and sociological implications, inescapably raises the question as to what effects it may exert upon the nutrition of peoples, upon their health, and indirectly upon their future. Although it is still too early to speak with certainty, evidence already in the medical literature, when correlated with observations made in Madrid during the period of the Spanish Civil War, and observations in Eastern Europe and in Russia at the close of the first World War, indicate the trend and suggests strongly the situations which may have to be met in the future if this trend is not reversed.

At the present time there is said to be no gross nutritional disease in Britain. Yet it appears that there are already demonstrable early signs of malnutrition which may be attributed to limitation of diet as a result of interference with normal foreign trade.

This shortage finds expression in the present-day civilian ration. The per diem allowances are as follows:

Meat—the equivalent of 26 cents per week, which may be estimated in terms of current prices in the United States at from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a pound of chopped round.

Fat— $\frac{1}{2}$ pound, of which only 2 ounces are in the form of butter, the remainder being supplied as margarine or animal fat. Fortunately the British government requires that margarine be fortified by the addition of adequate amounts of Vitamin A—in contrast to the laws of this country which prohibit the manufacturers of margarine from making it protective in the nutritional sense.

The average Englishman today is permitted to buy each week $\frac{1}{4}$ of a pound of bacon—approximately 6 strips; 2 ounces of cheese; 1 egg per week (if obtainable in the markets). He may also have somewhat less than $\frac{1}{2}$ a pint of milk per day. He is entitled to $\frac{1}{2}$ a pound of sugar per week and $\frac{1}{4}$ pound of preserves, which include syrup and honey. Two pounds of onions are made available for each ration book—that is, each family—until the next crop is harvested next summer.

Despite the obvious limitations of this ration, Sir John Orr, one of the great authorities on nutrition, states that there is as yet no evidence of deficiency disease. However, he points out that the average intake of some of the essential mineral salts and of many of the vitamins among poor families having children is lower than the minimum standard set by the British

Medical Association and by the League of Nations, and that in certain areas the early effects of limited diet are beginning to become evident. In support of this a study of workers' families in an industrial area shows that the available supply of animal protein is below the level considered necessary for permanent normal health. There is likewise a deficiency of certain of the mineral salts in the diets of these people and the incidence of anemia is higher than in normal times.

Another comparative study of school children confirms these observations. In 1939 only 7 per cent of the group were classed as malnourished; re-examination in 1940 revealed an incidence of malnutrition in 19 per cent. These early and probably as yet unimportant indications of malnutrition are to be directly attributed to interference with normal commerce. There is great difficulty in obtaining certain foods, particularly meat, fresh fruit and cheese. The total amount of food passing through stores has been reduced to approximately 50 per cent of the prewar supply.

The economic and social dislocations incident to the Civil War in Spain (1936 to 1939) afforded a unique opportunity for the study and evaluation of the effects of modern war upon the nutrition of considerable groups of people.

At the outbreak of the war and for several months thereafter, stored food supplies were adequate to meet the basic needs of the population. By the end of 1937, however, in Madrid the dietary was limited almost entirely to bread, rice and small amounts of pulses (peas, beans, lentils, etc.), and a very small amount of animal protein. At this time the earlier manifestations of deficiency disease became apparent in the population. In 1938 the diet was still more limited, particularly

with respect to the amount and quality of protein available, and in this year and in the spring of 1939 gross malnutrition and actual deficiency disease became prevalent to such an extent as to constitute a real public health problem.

The effects of this limited diet showed themselves predominantly in the form of pellagra, diseases and disorders of the brain and the nervous system, scurvy and the appearance of starvation or famine edema. As was to be expected, the incidence of these conditions presented two peaks, the first in the spring of 1938 and the second in the spring of 1939. Each peak followed the autumn and winter months, when garden produce was at best limited if available at all, whereas during the summer months with fresh garden truck at hand, the incidence of several of these conditions was diminished.

It has been said before that food is a munition of war. Current knowledge of nutrition and of the effects of malnutrition upon both health and morale of civilian and military groups gives this statement wider implication and much more force than it originally carried. In this country we like to think of ourselves as the arsenal of democracy. In the minds of many the connotation of the term "arsenal" implies the production of aircraft, tanks, and guns. The fact that production of food is of at least equal importance, especially in the fighting of a long war, is not generally appreciated. Many if not most people in this country believed until recently that the British Empire, indirectly at least, was fighting as a buffer protecting the freedom and the institutions of this country against the philosophies of the Axis powers. It was insufficiently appreciated, however, that if we sincerely desire Britain's success in the

war, we must insure the arrival abroad not only of the mechanical implements of warfare, but of the food which will permit both the civilian and the combatant population to use them effectively. Now that we are ourselves in the war, it is still more urgent for us to realize the role of food, for our allies as well as for ourselves.

The question may be raised: "What is a deficient diet?" In the first place, a diet which is defective in one respect is inescapably defective in many. The older methods still widely used for preparing white flour and white rice completely eliminate those portions of the grains which supply the vitamins and the mineral salts. Methods of cooking, especially the addition of soda to retain the color of fruits and vegetables, destroy the natural vitamins contained within them. The cooking of such foods in considerable amounts of water likewise results in large loss of these substances, which go into the discarded solution rather than remain within the foods. And certain of our national dietary habits, notably the use of large amounts of refined sugar in the form of cakes and pastry, candies and sweet beverages, not only exclude these food factors but actually increase the need of the body for them.

Another question may be raised: "What may an individual do to insure that his diet is adequate from the viewpoint of modern nutrition?" The daily dietary which contains 1 pint of milk, 2 servings of green vegetables and fruit, raw or properly cooked, whole-grain breads and cereals, and freshly cooked potatoes is considered adequate and protective.

The extensive development of the vitamin industry during the last few years has created a widespread impression that a diet which is fundamentally incorrect and insufficient may be completely corrected by the ad-

dition to it of certain pills or capsules or other pharmaceutical preparations. Few people, however, realize that despite the very great advances of the science of nutrition in the last twenty-five years, we still do not know all of the specific substances which are essential, nor do we know the amounts in which they are required day by day to maintain normal health.

It is an axiom in the treatment of malnutrition that the first step is to institute a completely adequate diet. This is not to imply that the pharmaceutical preparations of these food factors are not exceedingly useful and important; but using them suitably is a strictly technical procedure requiring knowledge of medicine and some instruction in the field of nutritional disturbances. It is likewise an axiom that the maintenance of perfect health is based similarly upon proper food habits and a regular daily dietary which contains all of those substances which the human organism requires in their natural form. A faulty diet cannot today be adequately compensated by the addition of vitamin preparations.

SCIENCE OF NUTRITION AT THE HOME BASE

by

Louise Stanley

THE mother who sees that her child is well fed is, in a practical sort of way, doing her part to make his childhood dreams come true. For good food is a basis for good health—future as well as present. And good health is often a key to efficient work on one's job, and to a thorough enjoyment of living.

Since the beginning of time, mothers have been eager to learn about the kind of food their children need. But never before has it been so easy to get information on this subject as it is at the present time.

For today, at long last, nutrition is recognized for the national and personal problem it is. Modern statesmen consider the feeding of a country as important to making it strong for defense as are guns and ammunition. Strong and alert nations, they realize, are built by strong and alert people. Strong and alert people are built by abundant and well-balanced diets. And the food a child gets today determines, in some measure, how strong and alert a citizen he will grow up to be.

That thinking men and women have come to be more and more concerned about the food this country is eating may be traced to two comparatively recent developments.

One is the great advance in our knowledge of nutri-

tion in recent years, which has made it clear that the food an individual eats fundamentally affects his health, strength, stamina, nervous condition, morale, and mental functioning. And food is of paramount importance to the normal growth, development, and health of children.

The second development is the progress made in finding out the nutritional status of our population, through dietary surveys. The direct indication of these surveys is that, in spite of our abundant resources, too many families in this country are not getting adequate diets.

Judging from one study conducted by the Bureau of Home Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, at least one-third of the nation's families are eating diets that are below the safety line for good nutrition. Thousands more select diets that just meet the minimum requirements to keep the body going. Only about one-third of all our families are eating what really can be classed as good diets: three meals a day that provide an adequate margin of safety consistent with the "health plus" we want for our children.

With the costs of living rising and with the migrations of war workers making it more difficult for some families to manage, there may be more families than usual in your community eating diets below the safety line for good nutrition. Let's see what that may mean to a child living in one of these families.

Some of these children in low-income families are actually hungry, because they aren't getting enough to eat. Some of them may show signs of well-defined deficiency diseases, such as rickets, scurvy, and pellagra. Some may have borderline cases of deficiency diseases hard for even a physician to detect.

But many more are suffering from hidden hungers

that show up in more subtle ways. Getting along on poor diets for weeks at a time takes its toll in chronic fatigue, shifting aches and pains, and certain kinds of digestive disturbances. Inadequate diets prevent a child's normal growth and development. They lower his resistance to disease, destroy his sense of well-being and his joy in being alive and able to do all the things that a normal child wants to do.

No matter how the results of poor diet manifest themselves in these children, one thing is obvious. They all lack the "health plus" our children rightfully should have.

Certainly, to let children grow up on poor diets is a shortsighted policy either from the family's or from the nation's point of view. But what can be done about it?

We find part of the solution in the very surveys that reveal the problems to be solved. Our study in the Bureau of Home Economics showed that while diets differed in different parts of the country, in general, one thing was universal. That is, when diets were poor or only fair they were low in certain minerals and vitamins, and sometimes in proteins of especially desirable types. Or, to put it another way, diets were most often deficient in certain foods that we have come to know contain these needed vitamins, minerals, and proteins.

Such foods are milk and the green, leafy vegetables, eggs, and foods rich in the vitamins of the B group, such as the whole grain flours and cereals. ("Enriched" white flour and bread are being "enriched" by having restored to them certain minerals and vitamins removed by the milling.) Fruits and vegetables rich in vitamin C also come in the protective class as do lean

cuts of meat, which are rich in B factors and proteins of high nutritive value.

Rough estimates made from facts revealed by the survey show that people of the United States would do well to use twice the quantity of dairy products they use today; from one-fourth to three-fourths more tomatoes and citrus fruits; and about twice as much of the leafy, green and yellow vegetables.

But while this nationwide study teaches its lessons and points out our big problems, it does not tell the whole story. Every family has its own dietary problems. One family may be getting plenty of dairy products, but neglect important whole-grain cereals. Another may be losing important food values because a careless cook throws them down the sink or cooks them to death.

The easiest way to make sure that a particular family is getting a good diet is to check that diet against a standard for a good diet. The basis for such a standard was set up in May 1941 at the National Nutrition Conference for Defense held in Washington, D. C. At that conference, eminent nutritionists from all over the United States adopted a yardstick for good nutrition—a goal toward which leaders in nutrition all agreed to aim in planning for better national nutrition.

This yardstick, in physical appearance, is nothing more than a table—a table that gives for persons in normal health the recommended daily allowances for the different food nutrients. The number of calories the diet should supply is specified; allowances are suggested for protein, calcium, and iron; the six best-known vitamins are given in terms of daily needs—either in milligrams or in International vitamin units.

Naturally, such a “yardstick” to be of help to homemakers has to be interpreted in terms of common

foods. And that is the job we in the Bureau of Home Economics, as well as nutritionists, doctors, and home economists all over the country, are doing. At the Bureau, we express the yardstick in terms of diet plans, menu guides, and sample marketing lists.

To be of the most help to homemakers we keep these diet plans elastic. We give them in terms of food groups, so that they may easily be adapted to particular foods available in different parts of the country and in different seasons of the year. We have worked them out at three cost levels—low, medium, and liberal. And we have worked them out for the whole family, calling special attention to foods that are most important to children.

For each diet plan we draw from eleven main food groups, because we find this the easiest and surest way to make up a diet that is well-balanced.

The food groups include:

- (1) milk in its various forms;
- (2) potatoes and sweet potatoes;
- (3) dry beans, peas and nuts;
- (4) tomatoes, citrus fruits, and other foods rich in vitamin C;
- (5) leafy, green and yellow vegetables;
- (6) other vegetables and fruits;
- (7) eggs;
- (8) lean meat, poultry, and fish;
- (9) flour, baked goods, and assorted cereals;
- (10) fatty foods, such as butter, margarine, lard, oil, vegetable shortenings, salt pork, and bacon; and
- (11) sugars, including jams, jellies, honey, sirups, and molasses.

Not all of these food groups are of equal importance.

Some are valuable for only one nutritive factor or contribution; others offer a combination of nutrients. But all should be represented. In some groups of food there are more products that are economical sources of several nutrients than there are in others.

For instance, in diets at all cost levels we emphasize milk and cheese, tomatoes, citrus fruit, and other vitamin C-rich fruits; and the green, leafy vegetables need emphasis. This is because of their many-sided values. If food money is limited, potatoes, dry beans, dry peas, soy-beans, peanuts, and whole-grain or enriched cereals and breadstuffs should be used in generous amounts.

With plenty of money for food there may be liberal amounts of eggs, meats, vegetables, and fruits of all kinds. And in no diet should flavorful sugars and fats, inexpensive sources of calories though they are, be allowed to displace the foods that safeguard diets in minerals, vitamins, and protein of high quality.

"Eat what you want after you have eaten what you should," may be followed as a rule in supplementing milk, vegetables, fruit, eggs, and meat. Naturally, food should be appealing as well as nourishing. But if there must be strict economy the family have the right to know when they are paying primarily for nutritive values and when for other satisfactions.

To illustrate the way in which we present our recommendations for adequate diets, let me cite our low-cost plan.

First item in the low-cost master plan is milk. This includes milk to drink, milk for cooking, and milk in the form of other dairy products. Every child gets 3 to 4 cups of milk a day or its equivalent. Every adult

gets 2 to 3 cups. Each expectant mother gets 1 quart, and a nursing mother $1\frac{1}{2}$ quarts. It is more important to have the quantity of milk listed every day than it is to get milk in any special form. Canned and dried milk may often be used in cooking.

The next item is fruits and vegetables.

Potatoes and sweet potatoes are called for about twice a day because they are economical sources of many of the food values specified in the nutrition yardstick. Dry beans, peas, and peanuts are called for two to four times a week, for the same reason. They are especially valuable as sources of iron and protein in low-cost diets.

Tomatoes, citrus fruit, or other vitamin C-rich foods are included 5 times a week at least. Every child under four is allotted 1 serving a day, every nursing mother, 1 to 2 servings daily. Among economical "other vitamin C-rich foods" are raw cabbage and raw salad greens.

Leafy green and yellow vegetables are served in a low-cost diet at least 6 times a week. And everyone in the family has 3 to 4 eggs weekly.

The diet plan provides 6 small servings of lean meat, fish, or poultry each week. There should be a cereal dish once a day, sometimes twice; bread in some form at every meal, and dessert once a day, if desired. Some of the cereals served should be the whole-grain kind. Where white flour and bread are preferred, they should be "enriched" to insure the essential iron and other minerals and vitamins.

Using this low-cost adequate diet plan, this is about how the marketing list would look for a week—for a family of moderately active adults, a boy 14 years old, and a girl 11:

- Milk—22 quarts;
- Potatoes and sweet potatoes—18 pounds;
- Dried beans, peas, and nuts—2 pounds;
- Vitamin C-rich foods, such as tomatoes, citrus fruit, raw cabbage—6½ pounds;
- Leafy, green, yellow vegetables—8¾ pounds;
- Other vegetables and fruits—8½ pounds;
- Eggs—15;
- Lean meat, poultry, fish—6¾ pounds;
- Flours and cereals—15½ pounds counting 1½ pounds of bread as 1 pound of flour;
- Fats—about 3 pounds;
- Sugars—about 4 pounds—counting white, brown, maple sugars and sirups, molasses, jellies, preserves, and candies.

The chief thing to keep in mind in planning low-cost diets is that you can't expect to get a lot of variety in the foods you buy. For when a diet is well-rounded for a minimum amount of money, you have to rely heavily on certain foods that are economical sources of a number of different food values.

For that reason, good cooking becomes doubly important. Variety can be managed even in low-cost food assortments by varying the way a food is served from day to day—and by imaginative seasoning.

No matter how much or how little is spent for food, however, cooking and serving up attractive food is the final link between the diet plan and the reality of a well-nourished family. For good, appetizing food is what really "sells" good nutrition to the family. So does everything else that makes eating fun—cheerful table conversation, comradeship, and laughter. Most of all it's food so good that the family eats it for the sheer joy of eating, not because it's "good for them."

It's food attractively served, skillfully planned, and well cooked. Unless meals have in them that element of human satisfaction they may go half eaten. And, uneaten, even the best planned food does not add up to a well-balanced diet.

Another way good cooking plays its part in good nutrition is in the saving of food values. Many of the very vitamins and minerals sorely needed in diets today are thrown down the sink, or are cooked away by careless homemakers.

To prevent these losses, the Bureau of Home Economics offers the following eleven rules:

When you boil foods, raise the temperature to the boiling point as rapidly as possible.

Use as little water as possible.

Save the water in which vegetables have been cooked. Use it in making gravies, sauces, and soups.

Don't use soda in cooking green vegetables.

Don't stir air into foods while they are cooking.

Before putting cooked food through a sieve, let it cool.

When short cooking methods are feasible, avoid long cooking processes, such as stewing.

Start cooking frozen foods while they are still frozen.

Serve raw frozen foods immediately after thawing.

After food is cooked, serve it at once.

Prepare chopped fruit and vegetable salads just before you serve them.

A good diet is made up of many food values, each having its particular indispensable contribution to make. We feel in the Bureau of Home Economics that by giving our diet suggestions in terms of common good

groups, we eliminate the pointless confusion that is caused by too much talk of vitamins, minerals, calories, or any other one food value. All these food values can be best supplied in a good diet of natural foods.

In making a good diet of natural food possible for every child in your community, the responsible workers or groups have three main tasks:

First, you can see that the diets of your own children measure up to the standard of a good diet. You can see also that your children form good food habits that will continue to be a health asset to them throughout their lives.

Second, pass on what you know to others by helping them plan better meals, prepare those meals more attractively and with less waste of food values.

Third, you can help see that the children in low-income families in your community get the advantage of available assistance of local, state, or Federal governments.

Special programs, such as the food-stamp plan, free school lunches, and low-priced milk, can help to take up the slack on diets of children from families who cannot afford even the low-cost assortment of foods that make up a well-balanced diet.

THE FAMILY IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

by

Lawrence K. Frank

THOSE concerned with marriage and family life are becoming increasingly apprehensive about what is likely to happen to the family in the years ahead. There has been a sudden increase in marriage among the men of military age; but after this passes there will undoubtedly be a postponement of marriage among the age group of women who would normally be married to the young men in the army. Many of these women may never marry since the returning soldiers are likely to marry women of a younger age group. When these men do return from the army it will be after a life of little responsibility for self-maintenance and conduct beyond obedience to order, so that they will have had little preparation for the responsibilities of marriage and family life and civilian duties. On the whole, therefore, army life and the experiences that accompany it are not conducive to marriage and homemaking and therefore may threaten if not impair family living later.

Numerous other dangers and threats to marriage and the family are apparent, including that intangible but pervasive influence of the stresses and strains which the present emergency involves. It has long been apparent that the movement of workers with their families to defense industries is creating grave difficulties because of lack of adequate housing and of facilities

for health, education, recreation, and welfare that are so acutely needed today. In addition, night shifts, the change over to defense work and the many other dislocations and deprivations are affecting families with cumulative seriousness.

However serious these various difficulties and hazards may be in themselves, their significance is greatly enhanced by the conditions under which marriage and family life had been carried on during the ten or more years of the depression preceding the outbreak of the second World War. When it is realized how much the home and the family have suffered from unemployment, reduced income and the frequent moving about in search of jobs or new opportunities to earn a living, then it must be clear that many families come to the present crisis already burdened with the weight of these years and the often tragic defeats which they had witnessed or endured.

It may be useful here to recall that, however much we sentimentalize about marriage and the family, our social life is nevertheless conducted with little or no consideration for the family. Business and industry and the professions, education and the church, government and indeed almost all our customary activities are carried on with the expectation that the family will make all the necessary concessions and adjustments, so that these agencies might continue in their usual course. When business and industry shut down and throw men and women out of work, the family is expected to take up the slack, to continue to provide for its members through such periods of unemployment. Only recently has there been any extensive effort made to mitigate through unemployment insurance, public and private, these periods of unemployment that so often wreck

family life. Then too, it is evident that the hours at work and the hours of school and the thousand and one demands that are made upon the home and the family to do this or that, are imposed by different organizations and agencies with little concern for the difficulties which their requirements may create in the family, or for the conflicts they engender with the demands made upon the family by other organizations.

The family, to use the slang expression, is supposed "to take it," no matter what happens; and when men and women struggling under these heavy burdens and exactions falter or give up the struggle, they are severely scolded, if not denounced, for not carrying on despite what has happened to them.

While we may rely upon the elasticity of human beings to stand up under stress and strain and to carry on family life, it is evident that even the most hardy and courageous are finding it difficult to create a home and maintain family life, including the bearing and rearing of children. The situation confronting young men and women differs so radically from the past, when they could, with their strength, ingenuity and courage, attempt to *make* a living, meeting situations and events with whatever skills and tools they could command. Today, however, the task is essentially that of *earning* a living by gainful employment or by making things to sell, subject to all the uncertainties of a money economy with changing prices and demand, and now war dislocations and shutdowns. The necessity of making a home and maintaining a family on an uncertain earned income is subject to further difficulties such as inadequate housing, crowded urban life, and the like. These are not only beyond change or improvement through any single individual's efforts, but for the most

part they directly obstruct the individual's attempts to find fulfillment of his needs and aspirations.

It is not too much, therefore, to say that this present crisis, in addition to bringing further threats, hazards and burdens peculiar to wartime, aggravates all the perplexities and obstacles with which the family has for so long had to contend. Already there are many different programs being organized to meet some of these difficulties. The national program for better nutrition aims at improving the nurture of children and adults on a nationwide scale with steps that will, it is certain, go beyond the mere proffering of dietary advice. Some efforts to meet the housing needs of both the old communities and the suddenly enlarged defense centers is also under way, but subject to prior demands of defense industry. The Social Security Board is providing, through the states, for unemployment and for old-age pensions which are in some measure reducing insecurity and the worry over the future for ever larger numbers. Concrete proposals designed to meet other needs of the family situation are being discussed and in some cases carried forward, as seen in the current studies and planning for better health care, for civilian defense preparations, for better protection of children and the like. All of these large-scale proposals for human welfare and better protection of individual men, women and children are directly or indirectly aimed to help the family, upon which rests the immediate responsibility for so much of daily living and care.

It is apparent, however, that these various programs to meet the difficulties facing the family must inevitably fall short of any very effective results, primarily because they are so largely conceived and carried out in terms of highly specialized, discrete programs. Family life must carry on continuously and coherently the house-

keeping, the providing of meals, the maintenance of health, the care and rearing of children, and all the other activities of the home. There is therefore danger that some of these very specific, partial programs, however well designed and useful, may only increase the difficulties of family life insofar as they may further complicate and unbalance, for large groups in the population, their customary designs for living. Moreover, they put the responsibility for correlating and integrating these separately organized and independently operated programs upon the family, which commonly lacks the technical skill and equipment and understanding for any such synthesis.

On the one hand we have the acute and often poignant human needs and difficulties of men and women and children which are inextricably bound up together and cannot be split up into separate component parts. On the other hand we have the various professional, governmental, business and other groups, and the organized welfare, health and other activities that we have set up under different auspices, with different goals and standards, and frequently with strongly competing interests and aims. It has been extremely difficult to persuade these diverse agencies and their personnel to see their tasks in terms of these interdependent needs of family life. The very highly organized technical, clinical, or educational services have frequently offered real obstacle to this task just because they are so well organized and because the personnel is so highly trained. Like highly specialized professional groups in the past, they cannot readily adapt their programs and methods to a sharing of their activity with others in the interest of the family, to say nothing of sharing with the "lay" public making up the families they wish to serve. And yet the problem is not insurmountable, for

in spite of differences in language, in concepts, and in detailed purposes, the health and welfare and educational agencies have been approaching each other. During the crisis it should be more urgent—and probably more easy—for them to join their efforts in common programs to serve common goals.

Anyone inclined to question the seriousness of this situation may find it illuminating to observe how the family fares in the hands of various professional groups and agencies to which an individual or family may go for advice, assistance or treatment. Nor is this difficulty limited to the so-called “underprivileged” and the dependent, since the families in the middle and upper classes also suffer from this fractionating atomizing treatment. What is becoming evident is that the family life of an individual is an integral part of his personality: the child’s family goes to school with him and is part of his learning and conduct; the patient’s family is involved in the illness that brings him to the clinic or the hospital and must be so recognized and treated or modified if the physician is to help the patient. Indeed, it may be said that whatever happens to the individual or is done for him impinges upon the family and all its members with greater or less effect, and is in turn conditioned by the family and its attitudes and interactions.

To bring some balance and congruity into these many scattered and often isolated endeavors, there is urgent need for recognizing marriage and the family as the common focus for the various agencies and specialists and a willingness to try to orchestrate their efforts upon this larger theme. There should be more co-operative planning of programs and skills, guided by a keener realization of what is needed if the young men and women embarking on marriage, as well as the older men

and women struggling to continue their home life, are to be helped in a constructive and integrative manner.

To assert the need of a unifying conception of the family, and to affirm that marriage and family life have positive values and priorities, to which other activities and purposes, business, government, and professional life, must be subordinated, may to some sound extreme and wholly unrealistic. Nevertheless, it may be stated with all possible emphasis that our government, business, industry, education and all our other organized activities cannot and will not continue if these basic needs and aspirations of men and women and children are too severely and too persistently thwarted, as we see them being neglected and frustrated today.

If we ask ourselves how the family is to survive through the difficult and strenuous days upon which we are now launched we must immediately recognize that the issue, not only for the family but for our society as a whole, will turn largely on the question of how well the morale of the family can be maintained through the crisis. When one speaks of morale it often brings up an image of large-scale, high-pressure campaigns to whip up enthusiasm and drive people to strenuous effort and severe sacrifices. Such programs may indeed be effective for short periods or limited objectives, but often they exhaust our energies and leave us so depleted that our morale is definitely damaged.

A program of morale for the family must, therefore, be addressed to a longer term task than just the immediate few years ahead. It must undertake by some means to invest the daily activities of living, of home-making, of child rearing with emotional significance and meaning whereby men and women can find the courage

and the faith to go on and can attain some fulfillment of their needs and hopes. As child rearing becomes increasingly a voluntary act, what men and women believe and hope for, what they will value as worth working and sacrificing for, will become ever more important if they are to make such affirmations as child rearing. The crucial problem of family morale is how to maintain these expectations and aspirations, to sustain those who, in their daily living, must continue to strive forward to uphold the standards of conduct that make human life significant. For this we all need some vision, some hopeful belief that social life can become more humanly conservative and fulfilling if we will ourselves continue to strive and hope and do our individual part in the larger social whole. Our major defense against the totalitarian propaganda is to show that we can *democratically* plan ahead and co-operatively work for a wiser, saner social order in which human values will be paramount.

The family has been increasingly displaced from its central position in the concerns of the community and of individuals. Thus we have to be reminded that when we attend to our own business or do our usual jobs, it is the family's business. This is because the existence of the family group in a money economy has been made to depend increasingly upon work and activities in which each person's share has become progressively more remote from the obvious and felt needs of the people at home. We can understand the old-fashioned family chores in terms of family needs and comfort—weather-proofing or warming the house, preserving or preparing food, cleaning or repairing clothes. But today, many of the activities and chores have been industrialized while most of us are engaged in tasks that we can

relate to the home only through a difficult intellectual effort.

The typical daily tasks take on such forms as writing letters about shipment of even date, or driving rivets on the frame of a bridge, or plugging the holes on a switch-board to correspond to telephone numbers received from unseen strangers, or repairing a leak in the water pipes of a laundry. These activities are certainly necessary to keep going our complicated fabric of economic life, which in turn supports the homes of the people as well as the culture and the institutions and the health and welfare and the satisfactions of these people. But it is seldom that the office worker or the riveter or the plumber or the telephone operator sees in these jobs, so remote from home and so impersonal, significant contributions to the comfort and happiness of women and children—of families like their own.

While each worker is impressed with the necessity and importance of completing his particular job in order to carry on the activity from which he gets the money income for his family, few are able to see or to remember that these are but instrumental to the vital and essential tasks of living. Perhaps the necessity of working on such insignificant and often futile jobs, or satisfying the whims and vanity of others, promoting purely personal advantages over others, or exploiting and often directly harming others, has compelled us to forget and ignore the question of what we are doing in our daily occupations. How can we have a sane, healthy society when there are such large discrepancies and conflicts between what we are doing to earn a living and the real purposes and needs of that life, to say nothing of the values we cherish?

Just because our public, vocational life has so little

meaning, probably the most significant aspect of marriage today is the growing need of men and women for some personal intimacy and fulfillment of their desire for affection, love and reassurance of personal worth. As we have been repeatedly told, the recent changes in social life have brought a progressive depersonalization and devaluation of the individual as he is caught in large-scale economic, governmental and social activities with the inevitable regimentation of technological operations. The family and marriage therefore offer almost the last refuge for the individual to find recognition and opportunity for his unique personal fulfillment, especially of his emotional needs. Thus men and women are seeking in marriage something beyond the formal prescribed privileges and duties of marriage as a social, legalized institution. They are attempting rather to develop an intimate relationship between personalities based on love and affection and individual worth in place of conjugal rights and duties that so often denied individual dignity and ignored love and affection. It is therefore not astonishing that so many marriages are frustrated or broken because men and women are seeking new, and be it emphasized, higher ethical goals in marriage than ever before.

Unless we recognize these emotional and ethical aspirations and the desperate need of men and women for help toward realizing them, all our elaborate programs for aiding the family may prove of little permanent value. Especially must we recognize that today child bearing is coming increasingly to be a deliberate choice, involving aspirations for the future and affirmations of human values. Otherwise we shall fail to understand how baffled and frustrated many young people are by lack of clearly defined goals and of aspirations compatible with their poignant hope for something bet-

ter than the cynical, conventionalized pattern of marriage which they so often see in their parents' generation.

If we look back to our pioneering ancestors or fore-runners, we will see that they often faced continual danger, uncertainty and hardships, and frequently the threat of complete destruction. They were able to meet these situations because they were sustained by the belief in the worthiness of what they were doing and seeking, and by a profound conviction that their individual efforts could and would make a difference. The young people of today are likewise pioneers, seeking a way of life that will have greater security, more dignity, and above all more fulfillment of their yearning desire for the love and affection of close personal intimacy that marriage should bring. They are ready to face the present and the future with courage and to make sacrifices, provided they have faith in the future and in the possibility of progressively attaining their ideals. Moreover, they can and will go forward energetically so soon as they realize that their ideals and their courage will make a difference by helping to bring the changed conditions and the better opportunities for achieving in marriage and family life what they seek.

Probably the greatest lack today is of leaders who can truly speak to youth, guiding them forward with awareness of their acute need for these higher ethical goals and arousing their enthusiasm and courage for such an endeavor. If, as is so often asserted, marriage is a failure, it reflects more upon those who should provide guidance to the hopes of youth than upon the bewildered young men and women who have been defeated in their hopes.

The morale of the nation, will, in all probability,

be sorely tried in the years ahead. It can be no better than the morale of the family, especially of women and children, however much we strive to spur on our efforts and arouse our enthusiasm in the army, in factories, on farms and in large-scale organized activities. To ask for a broader and more effective help to the morale of the family, therefore, is not a plea for the family alone but for the larger need and greater difficulties we face as a nation.

The task of building up and maintaining the morale of the family, as indicated earlier, depends in large measure upon what aspirations and what faith in human values we can muster in families. It will not be enough to provide additional nutrition and more and better social and health services, for these, however important, are only instruments for meeting the exigent needs faced by men and women today. What we do to and for the family, are not enough. The family itself must feel that what it does will make a difference. Each member of the family must be helped to see that his conduct and his efforts are significant to the family and to the community. How to make it possible for families to do the things that count and also to arouse the community response to the endeavors of the family is indeed a real challenge to our democratic faith in the importance of individual worth and achievement.

Because we have so largely taken the family and homemaking for granted, we have devised few if any ways of giving a family recognition and community or neighborhood approval for being a happy family and maintaining a home, for rearing children and otherwise carrying on. If we can provide ways of giving families some quiet, sincere homage for maintaining a way of life, then the creation and maintenance of a home and of family life may be furthered, despite the many obstacles and hindrances, because men and women will

feel this intangible but potent group approval and support to their endeavors. If all those who come in contact with the family, in all of their various capacities, could be enlisted as agents for building up family morale as part of their specialized duties and services, then we might begin to approach something in the way of a more effective program of maintaining morale in family life. Such an attempt would go beyond the mere meeting of the present emergency and would begin to clarify the future for family life in this country. Moreover—and this should be strongly emphasized—every effort to formulate a coherent philosophy of family life and to clarify the personal and social values to be sought through marriage and family life would in itself provide a vision of the new social order that we must sooner or later seek to attain, as the embodiment of our democratic belief in the value of individual human personality.

.

THE AMERICAN FAMILY: FLEXIBLE AND RESILIENT

by

Eduard C. Lindeman

THE United States was not to be spared from participation in the tragedy of our era. We too must pass through the "fiery trial." Our generation, to continue Abraham Lincoln's searching language, will also go down "in honor or in dishonor." This is so because wars can no longer be isolated. War is a social disease but, unlike organic diseases, its victims cannot be quarantined.

Psychologically, the American people were not prepared for the events through which they must live. The sensitive ones were still seeking—to the last minute—some escape. They hoped that they would be "let off." The less sensitive ones, who do not make fine distinctions between good and evil, were still seeking a compromise. They seemed to believe that the good to which we cling might be salvaged if we allowed it to be commingled with evil. These are unrealistic alternatives. The plain truth of the matter was terrifying; but it finally had to be faced.

We are in the midst of a world-wide revolution the outcome of which will set the pattern of life on this planet for a long long time to come. Whether we like it or not does not matter. We are involved in this revolution and alibis will lead merely to degradation and dishonor. We can be saved only by positive action.

But we will be capable of effective action only if we have some sense of the direction in which we wish to move, only if we come to substantial agreement as to the essence of this democracy we are out to defend.

In the early part of the nineteenth century a famous French political philosopher, de Tocqueville, came to this country, examined us with great care, returned to his students in Paris and began a series of lectures on American Democracy. In the first of his lectures he spoke in somewhat unconventional style and said to his students with a kind of smile and a bit of humor: "You know, these Americans are the funniest people I have ever seen anywhere on earth. And one of the queer things about them is this: in every community where you go in America, you will find that if somebody recognizes that there is a need which has not yet been fulfilled, he goes and talks to one or two people about it and the first thing you know there is a committee. And then, the next thing you know, they are out fulfilling that need. In the meantime, they have consulted no bureaucrats, no officials; they have done this all by themselves out of their private personal energy."

De Tocqueville followed this lecture by stating the law of democratic health, and the law reads something as follows: "You can tell when a democracy is healthy by the quality of functions performed by private initiative—not the number but the quality. And when a democracy is sick, it is because it no longer can generate within its private groups the initiative and the energy to perform new and inventive tasks."

On the basis of this criterion, we have a healthy democracy. We probably have more voluntary organizations with some sort of public purpose, per thousand of the population, than any other country. Nearly everybody belongs to so many societies promoting

quite different but all worthy causes, that we may sometimes wonder whether they do not to a degree cancel each other out. At any rate, we are seriously in need of one more educational society or movement—one to acquaint us with the innumerable agencies and institutions which we possess for human welfare. I don't know how it is going to be done but I do know that it is becoming more and more important that those institutions which call themselves voluntary shall very soon interpret to the public what they are doing and give excellent reasons why it ought to be done. This may be especially important in view of the many kinds of taxes we are going to have to pay in the future and in the light of the various compulsions placed upon us by government.

I have been trying to think of some way by which we could give an interpretation of one or another of our agencies in a sort of thumbnail sketch. Each of them has a history, which in a way justifies it, at least for its beginning. You could start in and say it has a half-century of history. Upon what basis did it come into existence? Well, it came into existence at a time when we were beginning to realize that nature does not provide us with instinctive abilities which make us good parents, although that was once a popular belief. The more we moved into a scientific era, the more we saw there was no assurance that merely because you have a child you are also going to know how to rear it, or that merely because you get married you are going to know how to live in family life.

Mr. Horace Mann, by the way, said this earlier I suppose than anyone else in American education. He said in 1836: "Love will never instruct the mother what materials or textures of clothing have the proper conducting or nonconducting qualities for different

climates or for different seasons of the year. Love is no chemist or physiologist, and therefore, will never impart to the mother any knowledge of the chemical or the vital qualities of different kinds of food, of the nature of the functions of the digestive system, nor indeed of any other of the various functions on which health and life depend."

Mr. Horace Mann said many wise things long before the educators in America took advantage of them. But it was in recognition of the practical needs implied in this statement by Mann that the Child Study Association came into existence a little more than half a century ago for the purpose of getting a better understanding of the nature of child life and of the nature of that unique intimate relationship which we call the family, with its faithfulness to human personality. The pioneers sought their ends not merely by lecturing to mothers, but they did it in two ways which are distinctive: They were extremely progressive in finding all the new ideas which were coming from the various sciences, especially the biological sciences, and which would throw light on childhood and parenthood. And then they very wisely avoided the pitfall of merely getting experts to tell mothers and fathers what to do. They brought the mothers and fathers into relationship with the experts and teachers in such small groups as to make a sharing of experiences possible.

That was a truly democratic kind of educational movement which they inaugurated and have perpetuated during all of these years. In the present emergency, the distinctive point of view which this organization has developed through the years appears to me to be especially relevant. The traditions and skills and procedures built up by the Child Study Association are characteristically democratic and in thorough harmony with

the great goals which this nation has set. For they derive from sincere preoccupation, on the part of hundreds of intelligent and sensitive men and women, with the workings and the meanings of the family.

The family, that institution from which all others are derived and by which they are justified, will quickly feel the impact of the war. Indeed, many of the consequences are already apparent. On the other hand, the family will have an important influence upon the course of the war.

I am told that one of the most popular maxims of the Chinese people, who, let it be remembered, have been fighting a ruthless aggressor for more than four years, runs as follows: *Only those who hate war can win this war.* If the war is won by those who glorify war and the use of force, democracy and human freedom will disappear. Where the family stands firmly, men hate war.

The United States has now become one of the most, if not the most, important factor in determining who the victor is to be. We were forced, before we were ready to make our decision, to enter this war as an all-out belligerent; but the consequences of war were destined to fall upon us in any case. We have been moving steadily and irrevocably toward the establishment of a war economy. Hence it becomes the responsibility of those who are devoted to our institutions to observe the effects which a war economy will exert upon them. We cannot prevent the rise of a war economy but we can, by thinking and acting, prevent the war economy from destroying those values upon which our democratic experience rests.

In preparation for this cataclysm, we have necessarily taken away from the family circle young men who

are now living in army barracks. Other young and middle-aged men have moved away from their home localities to work in war industries. On account of war some three to five million men will now be deprived of normal family experience. Families will tend to move about in space at an accelerated rate, thus contributing to the increase of family instability. The family for which we shall need to plan in the future will thus be a family having much less permanency with respect to locality. Those institutions and agencies which serve family needs will, therefore, be obliged to adapt themselves to new procedures as well as to much larger operations if these services are to be maintained.

A second immediate effect of war is the economic. I am afraid that we are going to live under a war economy for a minimum of six years and a maximum of thirty. I hope I am wrong on both ends, but I cannot see it otherwise.

The economic dislocations which ensue when a nation devotes a large proportion of its productive energies to war will become evident first of all in family life. Inflation, to take the item about which economists are so deeply concerned, shows itself first of all in family experience. The initial danger signal of an inflationary movement appears when the housewife is told that she must pay fifty instead of forty cents for a dozen of eggs. The family is the principal consuming unit and hence exercises a determining influence upon both the productive enterprise and the credit machinery of a nation. If prices continue to rise and family income does not keep pace, the standard of living is quickly lowered.

In a way, economy commodities are bound to become scarcer, both because goods which might have gone into consumption must now be used for destruction, and because a large military establishment re-

quires goods far in excess of normal requirements. In the last war, for example, we learned that every soldier needed three overcoats, one to wear, one on its way to take the place of the one now being worn but which will soon wear out, and another in the process of being made in some American factory. When commodities become scarce the price goes up. When prices go up, families suffer. The equation is simple enough but the consequences are exceedingly complex and far-reaching.

A third immediate consequence comes directly from these others—namely the disruption or dislocation of the family group and the economic disturbances. This has a certain effect on what we so glibly subsume under such terms as “morale.” One of the effects of inflation, for example, is a growing suspicion between classes. Consumers will distrust retailers, retailers will distrust wholesalers, wholesalers will distrust manufacturers, and if the inflation goes far enough, everybody will distrust the government. It will be noted that this growth of suspicion begins in the family and spreads until the morale of the nation is shaken.

When there exists an external danger it usually happens that internal conflicts and tensions subside. Our personal frictions are somehow absorbed by the larger and more dramatic conflict. This does not mean, however, that the personal conflicts are being resolved. Relations between husbands and wives and between parents and children, and also family-to-family relations, are all involved. We are still paying a heavy price for the mass unadjustments which followed in the trail of World War I.

This suggests strains on our courage, our devotion, our persistence. How well can we take up these strains? The answer must be at least in part in the clarity of

our vision and the realism with which we face the facts. One of the reasons why so many people in the world at present don't know what the score is comes from the fact that they don't know what game they are playing. They don't even know what direction the goal posts lie in, so you can't expect them to have good ideas or good feelings. There are certain convictions which we must realize before we can have the strength for this crisis, strength and the feeling of a kind of gallantry to carry us forward. Some of these I would like to mention briefly.

The first is that old maxim about the fixity of human nature. This is of course usually invoked in cynical disparagement of the very characteristics that distinguish humanity from the beasts. Idealism is thus belittled as futile sentimentalism that will not hold up against harsh realities. On the other hand, many of us have come to take for granted the amenities and decencies that have been slowly and painstakingly built up through the centuries as if they were anchored in the granite of the hills. The thing we have learned in the last forty years more definitely than almost anything else about human nature is its extreme flexibility. You can turn one in every possible direction, you can transform people overnight: one day they are this kind of person and the next day they are another kind of person. You know individuals nowadays whose whole career has gone along a certain line, so that you feel almost as though you could project it by a normal curve into the future. But then they catch some kind of disease, the disease which is spreading around the world. You see them in a few moments lose their sense of humor; in a few more moments, or days, or months, you see them again and now they are angry about something; in

another month or two they hate somebody: they have come to personalize their hatred. They are stirred by strange but violent internal processes which destroy their relations to others, which alter radically their own customary responses to all sorts of situations, and which transform them into new persons—transform their nature, if you please.

You have seen this happen to your friends. It is a little healthier now in New York City than it was last year or two years ago. Almost any time I left New York City during that period, I knew that when I came back I would have lost some friends; they would have taken on some new kind of "ideology," and then they would hate me.

This notion that human nature is extremely flexible is true individually and collectively. We have seen individual and mass religious conversion. We have seen individual and mass yielding to the impact of propaganda. What has Mr. Hitler done in Germany? He has reversed the historic trend in Germany. Fifteen or twenty years ago, would we have thought that a whole people could start in one direction, with the noblest of purposes and the finest of sentiments, resolved to make the world a better place to live in, and then, within a few months of propaganda and reckless exploitation of the common misery be turned in a totally different direction? It can be done.

And that suggests a second realization that has to be cleared up somehow: this is the vulnerability of the democracies. What makes us so vulnerable? Why have we toppled over, one after another? I suppose there are dangers in oversimplifying this question, but my answer is extremely simple. I think the democracies are vulnerable because we have thus far found no satis-

factory method of teaching people a sense of responsibility. We apparently just don't know how to teach the people to feel responsible.

The development of democracy during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been almost wholly a development of ships with sails and no rudders. If you steam ahead with freedom but no self-imposed organization or restraint, you can't have democracy on those terms. Democracy implies that people are going to be organized and self-controlled within themselves. The price of freedom is self-control.

I hope that an illustration which has moved me deeply will help us conceive more clearly how this can happen. I reread recently that famous trilogy of Anatole France's about politics, especially democracy. Perhaps I was subconsciously wondering whether he who was so wise about human nature in so many other ways had also seen how people who love freedom could still become weak people, and how there could be decadence among the free.

Suddenly I came across this little scene in one of the volumes, the one which really characterizes the series, *The Opinions of Jerome Croignard*. There is a conversation between the Abbé and a friendly visitor, also greatly interested in politics, a Mr. Shipman by name. The Abbé is telling the English visitor what he thinks is likely to happen in France some day. This was written in 1913. He is speaking of the ruling class, the responsible people in France:

"They will receive from the general assemblies only an uncertain and precarious authority. Unable to indulge in far-flung hopes and vast dreams, they will spend their ephemeral existence in wretched expedients. They will grow jaundiced

in the unhappy effort to read their orders on the faces of the mob, ignorant and at cross purposes. They will languish in restless impotence.

"They will become unused to foresee anything or to prepare for anything and they will study only intrigue and falsehood, and finally, they will fall, and fall from so low that their fall will do them no harm and their names chalked on the walls by little scribbling boys will make the bourgeoisie laugh."

Mr. Shipman knocks out his pipe and turns meditatively toward the Abbé and says, "It is possible; it is possible. I can imagine that the French will some day reach such a state."

Yes, it is possible in a democracy where there is no continuing development of the sense of responsibility that you can sink to this level, and then, any ruthless aggressor can conquer you.

The third of these realizations that seem to me important in our crisis has to do with the complexity of the human being itself, especially from the point of view of our classifying people into good and bad. Not only are there good spots in "bad" people, but also bad spots in those we consider "good." This we have to realize before we can participate purposefully and effectively in contemporary life, for it is fundamental if we are to rediscover a new educational formula.

To me the most tragic moments of the last few years have been the sudden discoveries of those bad spots in people upon whom I had counted, people to whom I had given my trust and my confidence—and then suddenly the great issues come, and the bad spots are

revealed. It is symptomatic of a very weak moral preparation for life in our kind of a world.

I take some blame for that, since I happen to belong to that school of American education which calls itself "pragmatic." I think we have some atonements to make because we have placed so much emphasis upon techniques and methods that for many the effect has been to ignore entirely the search for the ends and the values of life. We seemed to expect that excellent results would somehow grow from the "good means," the kind of which Emerson speaks: "If you have had good means, you would be bound to get good ends." We didn't suspect we could get a period of history in which the whole formula would have to be reversed.

I have selected three varieties of disturbances to family life which we may expect as a result of our war economy, one affecting the structure of the family itself, one pointed at the basic economic functions performed through families, and the last in the more subtle area of human interrelationships. These illustrations are, perhaps, sufficient to indicate that all persons who are aware of the fateful nature of family experience and who also believe in the fundamental values of family life must now begin to lay plans for the future. We cannot wait until these wars are over. If we now march off to war and allow families to shift for themselves, we are destined to receive a rude awakening when we return and find what damage has been done.

I have tried also to emphasize three considerations regarding our assumptions about human nature and human values, as these bear on any plans of statesmanship or of education—or of our daily lives. I have called attention to the fallacy of assuming that the personality has a final and unchanging "nature," whether

for good or evil; I have indicated the dangers in our democracy, which has too often been a merely negative and irresponsible "freedom" that threatens to enslave us all; and I have pointed to the urgent necessity of revising our educational theories in consideration of fundamental values, and to the danger of relying on efficient methods as if they could by themselves assure the results we desire.

If in this revolutionary storm that is upon us it is possible to find any meaning, I think it is this:

Individuals and nations now defending themselves against aggressors and the cultural conceptions which these aggressors aim to realize in the world have two objectives in mind: (1) they aim to remove the threat of aggression and thereupon construct a world founded upon law, order, honor, freedom and human worth; (2) they aim to set to work in earnest to fulfill the promises of democratic culture.

One of the first items on this agenda must certainly be that of furnishing families with greater economic, social and psychological security. The democracies are fighting for their right to existence but they are also fighting to make that existence more stable, more humane and more just. This program calls for an expansion of all our skills, but even more important, it demands an extension of social feelings. The war will demand terrific sacrifices, and it will certainly lower the standards of living for all of us. But if our democratic presumptions are sincere, we Americans must agree that our democracy looks toward the time when our families will be sheltered in good and beautiful homes, when all members of the family group will be properly nourished, and when they will receive effective medical attention and an appropriate education. In short, the

democratic ideal implies that we all want everybody to enjoy a good life. A good life begins in families; otherwise, it is unattainable.

A democratic plan for a good life will not come about by accident. Nor can it be brought into existence by postponing in reliance upon postwar reconstruction. The right mood will not exist when peace arrives unless it is cultivated and practiced now, now while war is being prosecuted. The requirement is, therefore, plain. We must now strengthen all institutions and agencies which serve family needs.

The program which I am recommending, namely to defend ourselves with one hand while reserving the other for improving our democracy, is not meant of course to divide our efforts mathematically, but merely to emphasize the dual nature of our task. Whatever the war demands, we shall do; but looking after our democracy will present fewer difficulties if we remember that the "breaks" in history—wars and revolutions—take place within a larger context of continuity. Changes always come with greater speed during such epochs, but these changes all have their antecedents. The family, for example, is a "tough" institution. Its resiliency has been severely tested. But, in order to survive the type of attack which is now embodied in the anti-democratic forces of our time, the family will also be required to reveal qualities of flexibility. If I may be permitted an expressive word from the realm of slang, I believe that the American family "can take it," but I also believe that it will need all the resources of guidance and help which our society can afford. If we are capable of bringing these resources into play now, now while the danger mounts, we shall discover a strength which we did not suspect. This nation can, I believe, count on its families, those innumerable living units from which the life of a nation springs.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE NATIONAL PURPOSE

by

Anna M. Rosenberg

WHEN John Jones, or Salvatore Colucci, or Sam Cohen, or William O'Brien—or any others of the millions of small people who combine to make America—read that the United States may spend more than one hundred billion dollars for its defense, I don't think that this colossal sum is real to them. John Smith, with a family income of \$1,000 to \$1,200 a year, struggling to make ends meet with pennies and dimes, cannot grasp the meaning of one hundred billion dollars. It is too far beyond his actual experience and the scope of his imagination.

Of course, he does not oppose the expenditure of this sum—or any other sum—if he believes, as he does, that it is necessary to expend it to defend his country. But for him, and to him, these billions must be translated into something concrete and real. Just as one hundred billion dollars is an unreal term, whereas \$30 a month for rent is something tangible, so “defense,” itself, requires translation into everyday experience.

Defense for what? Defense of what?

There, I think, John Jones will be on surer ground when he interprets defense as his everyday way of life, and the needs that go with it. It means the things that he has learned are his through his government. It means the right to have these things protected and improved. They are simple and obvious—the right to a

job, to get ahead, to a measure of security now, to the promise of a little security later on. And to me, it is in the little man's understanding that these are the things which America is defending that the value of the Social Security Act lies.

This is not a new feeling. It is not one which has emerged spontaneously with the sudden onrush of defense sentiment, or with our entry into the war. It is something which was engendered when the Social Security Act was first passed in 1935. Imperfect as that legislation may have been from the standpoint of total security—and no one was more aware of its imperfections than we who were called upon to administer it—it gave the American people a new sense of participation and partnership with their government, and the feeling that the government was assuming a new role in helping the individual establish some measure of protection against the hazards of daily life.

He knew, perhaps, very little about the actual provisions of the Social Security Act, but he did know that through the Act, the government was giving those who were already old a better opportunity to live out their remaining years in dignity and comfort. He knew that the individual states were passing unemployment insurance laws which would help him at least in a limited degree to fill the financial gap between the job he lost and the next job he might obtain. And above all, he knew that a national system had been established whereby, when he became too old to work, he would receive monthly retirement benefits from his government. To millions of Americans, these things brought them for the first time an intimate and personal contact with something which hitherto had been vague and disembodied—the government of the United States.

We began to hear the phrase: "My social security." From the standpoint of an administrator, perhaps I should want to discourage the use of this phrase. Administratively, it might be my responsibility to point out that it is confusing, because although it has become synonymous with the government's insurance program, "social security" is a broad, over-all term embracing a number of programs. That is what I should do as an administrator.

But I am afraid that I am not very strict about it. Frankly, I like to hear people talk about "my social security." This proprietary identification conveys a sense of promise, of a stake in the individual's future, of a greater measure of protection against the uncertainties of that future. I like to have workingmen come up to me after meetings which I address, and proudly pull out their Social Security account cards and show them to me. I like to have farmers and small shopkeepers come up to me when I am in upstate New York and ask me, "When am *I* going to get social security?" And when people speak in this way, I feel that it shows how far they have come to think of themselves at one with the government.

This, I think, is the contribution of the Social Security Act to the defense program. It is not something you can measure in dollars and cents. But it is there nonetheless. It is one of the things which the little people of this country will think of first, when drawing up their own lists of the things we are going to defend.

This sense of partnership with the government which I have mentioned was deepened considerably when the Social Security Act was amended beginning with 1940. I do not wish to go into the technicalities of these amendments here; it is sufficient to note that they changed the entire philosophy of the old-age insurance

program. It may be recalled that originally this program provided for retirement benefits at 65 for the qualified worker. With the amendments, it became a program of survivors' insurance as well. Today, the program is called Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. In addition to retirement benefits for the worker, supplementary benefits are provided for his aged wife. In the event of death, there are benefits for the worker's aged dependent parents, and—most important of all—survivors benefits are paid to the wife and small children of a deceased worker. In effect, this means that from a system of retirement protection for the worker only, the program now covers the worker's family as well. His family also has a stake in the government.

If you could visit any of the field offices of the Social Security Board, you would learn what this change means in terms of human beings. I have seen a widow, tense and stricken by the recent death of her husband, full of panic because of a future containing nothing but stark destitution. She came into an office and learned that for the next fifteen years she and her children would receive \$75 a month from the government. I have seen the reaction of the widow to this news. All she had hoped for from the office was to be directed to some agency where she could receive assistance. Instead, she learned that she was *entitled* to monthly payments which would come to her, not as a matter of charity, but because of a contractual obligation her husband had with the United States Government.

This is taking place every day in field offices of the Social Security Board all over the country. In some, the scene is a little bit different. The widow knows that the monthly payments are available to her, and in her case, there is a sense of confidence and of ability to

face the future because of them that is equally heart-warming.

The payments, you must bear in mind, became payable only in 1940. Their effect on the national economy is not yet considerable. Their effect on the national consciousness, however, is already tremendous. For even in this short time, as these monthly checks have been going out to every city and town and village in America, they have been pervading public consciousness. They are translating into concrete and moving terms the sense of partnership with the government which sprang up when the Social Security Act went into effect.

This contribution to morale is one which the United States Government should and must make to its people if it is to justify the stringent demands which the government, in turn, is making upon its people today. That applies not only to the Social Security Act; it applies to all social and economic legislation which can improve the well-being of the people of this country. There you have in a nutshell the entire illogic of the proposition that in a period when a nation is concentrating on national defense, its people must forego, for the time being, social gains. It is illogical because it minimizes the value of what we are defending—it obscures the meaning of our very struggle.

The soundness of these views has already been demonstrated elsewhere. When France went to war, it immediately suspended its most important social legislation. It supported this proposal which we have heard in this country, of halting social progress during the war period. But it did not work. On the contrary, it led to a further breakdown of national morale, which undoubtedly hastened France's downfall.

England, on the other hand, took the opposite point

of view. With the outbreak of war, one of its first moves was to strengthen social legislation along all lines. Benefits were liberalized. New types of protection were incorporated into its social security program. Defense volunteers and wage earners injured by enemy attack were granted compensation, as were their survivors. Wives and children of mobilized men received allowances. The unemployment compensation program of Great Britain was liberalized to provide for persons and families in distress. For the people who were bombed out of their homes, buildings were requisitioned. Property damaged because of bombings was insured by the government. Thus, the social security program was considerably strengthened while at the same time family morale was held up at a high level. Certainly, the British soldier can perform his duties with a greater degree of efficiency when he is fortified by the knowledge that his government is caring adequately for those at home.

We all fervently pray that it may never be necessary in this country to establish "bombed-out" compensation, along with the other special war emergency types. But at the same time, they do serve to emphasize the fact that in a period such as the one through which we are passing we must strengthen the people of this country, not only with a continuous stream of tanks and airplanes, but with a continuous concern for their social well-being.

Certainly, the Social Security Act can serve as a case in point. Even if this emergency had never arisen, the Act was ready for improvement and liberalization. Today, that is doubly so. Furthermore, there is every justifiable reason for such improvement. To me, administration of the Social Security Act has always been a pleasant task because, in addition to the work with

existing provisions, there has always been the knowledge that I was participating in the evolution of dynamic legislation. There is nothing static about the Social Security Act, because there is nothing static about human progress and the social progress with which it is bound up.

The Social Security Act of 1935 was only the foundation for a social program. The amendments of 1939 constitute the first addition to that foundation. Now we are ready for further improvements. What should these improvements be? There is no definite answer. We can have as little or as much social security as we want to pay for. But there are certain obvious gaps in the program, as it stands today, that should be filled.

First: Great segments of our population are not as yet covered either by the unemployment insurance program, or by Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance. Two great groups especially—agricultural workers and domestics—are in need of protection. Certainly, they are as economically insecure as were the groups which have already been included in the program. Their exclusion under the original Act was a matter of administrative necessity, but now that the Social Security Board has had a number of years of experience in the complexities of administering the Act, it feels that it can take on new groups.

Second: In addition to these two groups there are millions of self-employed—the small merchant and businessman—who do not have coverage. Indeed, we cannot truly say that we have a national social security program until every person—regardless of trade or occupation—is covered by it, and it is this goal of universal coverage to which I look forward.

Third: We have learned, too, that the unemployment insurance system requires improvement. In many

states, the benefits have proved inadequate, and the required waiting period before the unemployed worker may receive the benefits is too long. Moreover, the period during which benefits are payable is too short. Last year (1940) more than one-half of all workers in the United States who were receiving benefits were still unemployed after they had exhausted their benefit rights.

These are gaps which should be filled immediately. Their importance will be magnified many times after we have passed the peak of war production and are then threatened once more with a rising tide of unemployment. Then it will be absolutely necessary for us to have a more adequate system of unemployment insurance if we are not to plunge into another economic debacle.

Fourth: There is another serious gap in the present social security structure. We say that we have set up a social security program because there are certain hazards in life which cannot be foreseen, and for which we must make provision. Under our legislation we have singled out principally unemployment, old age, and death. Yet consider this paradox with regard to unemployment: Under the general provisions of unemployment insurance legislation, benefits are paid to the unemployed worker if he loses his job through no fault of his own, and *is available for other employment*. But if a worker gets sick, he is not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits because obviously, he is not available for other employment. Surely, sickness is as much a hazard as any of the other factors. It is one of the most important causes of dependency. Yet, the sick worker has no protection whatever under the Social Security program.

Fifth: There is an equally wide gap in the insurance

program. Its provisions for retirement, and especially those for a surviving wife and small children, are socially excellent. Consider, however, the case of John Smith, a worker of about 30, with a wife and three small children. Should John Smith go through life and reach 65, he and his wife will be entitled to retirement benefits. Should he die tomorrow—or at any time before his children become 18 years old—his wife and minor children will be entitled to monthly payments by virtue of his own coverage under the system. But, if instead of dying, he should go out tomorrow and be crippled for life in a street accident, there is no protection for him or for his children until he reaches the retirement age. He may have to face the prospect of 35 years without any compensation from this program.

These criticisms of the present Social Security Act may make it appear to be a very weak and hollow instrument. They are not advanced in that spirit. I doubt that we could have incorporated the provisions I suggest at the very beginning of the program, because then the whole structure might have proved unwieldy, from an administrative standpoint. I advance these suggestions to support the thesis that social security is a living thing—that it is subject to change and growth with a nation's change and growth.

The changes I have suggested I should like to see put into effect as soon as possible. We have become a nation strong and proud in our natural resources and our technological wonders. Over the past hundred years, we have been developing a national philosophy of preservation of natural resources—water power, minerals, forests, earth. We recognized that their conservation is necessary to make our nation strong in the

output of goods and materials which would add to the comfort and prosperity of its people.

We must bring that same philosophy to the conservation of our people's spiritual resources. We chart our war program in terms of monthly output of horse power, machine guns, freight carloads, steel capacities. We cannot chart defense in terms of measured units of morale and spirit. But it would be tragic indeed if we did not recognize that those things, too, are of equal importance to the national war effort. They are the things which make a free people appreciate freedom, and arouse in them the determination to perpetuate that freedom.

The Social Security Act represents a common purpose of our people to meet common needs. However incompletely it may achieve the goal, we have to recognize it as our way of carrying out the people's will. No individual and no group may presume to speak of the services rendered through this Act as a free bounty graciously granted the people by the taxpayer or by the official. The people have decided to assure themselves a wiser use of their own resources, of their own country. And it is only to the degree that the people can see our governmental and other public agencies working toward the fulfillment of their dreams that they will give themselves to this country, for this country.

We cannot hold up a hollow shell and ask for its defense. We cannot abolish every semblance of the decent things that people live by and substitute for them vague prospects of a future superman. The things that make a nation great are the things that make life for the small people of that country more than bearable. Only to the degree that the people of this country believe that America is dedicated to the improvement of its people's—their own—hope of today and promise of the future will they want to defend it.

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN CAMP AND COMMUNITY

by

Mark A. McCloskey

THE present world situation throws a peculiar burden on the American people. All around us the foundations of our culture are under attack. In this wild tempest of world affairs, when we are already in the gale, however well or ill prepared, every man and woman in the American nation is called to his station. Our immediate national responsibility is twofold: to defend our own nation with armed force; and at the same time to produce, in larger and larger quantities, supplies for our embattled allies and neighbors. This means concretely not alone keeping our population at work on the thousands of details that are necessary for maintaining the armed forces and for producing all war essentials. It means also and just as urgently keeping all the men, women, and children in health and vigor, and at the highest possible pitch of single-minded determination for victory.

The mobilization of men in the armed forces and the concentration of men and women in defense industries have had far-reaching results on community life. With American vigor and foresight, we are determined, in meeting this crisis, not only to provide to the best of our ability for those who are carrying the direct burden of the war, but at the same time to create out of this situation permanent gains in community life. Unlike the totalitarian countries, we do not have a pre-

determined pattern. Our future rests, instead, upon our freedom of action, guided by our faith in the democratic way of life.

Mobilizing and training a million and a half men for the armed forces has been a difficult job. The problems inherent in establishing and maintaining high standards of selection have been handled with intelligence and justice. Moreover, these men are a testimony to the American families from which they come. I have seen them by thousands and by hundreds of thousands. They are the most intelligent, healthy, self-reliant group of young people ever gathered together in any army on the face of the earth.

In the present war, long before the fighting began, a psychological contest was under way. New words which bespeak this struggle have sprung into our vocabulary. "Fifth column" and "war of nerves" indicate enemy efforts to undermine confidence in ourselves, in our leaders and in our democratic way of life. This inward corroding process we had to fight and we continue to fight, and the most effective way of fighting it is by means of aggressive and constructive programs for better community life.

Many have been using the word *morale* to describe the condition we are considering. In simplest terms, morale is the feeling of having a job to do, of being capable of doing it, and of being determined to do it. I believe that the men in the Selective Service have this morale. They are capable, they see their job in the defense of the nation, and this training provides them the opportunity to demonstrate their willingness to do it.

The organization of activities directed toward rais-

ing and maintaining morale in the army and navy is now a recognized branch of military and naval service. During the last war, private agencies were responsible for morale activities in the camps and overseas. When the war was over, the army and navy assumed these responsibilities as a function of command, and morale divisions were created. They are aided by the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation. The morale divisions are responsible for supervision of program, for post exchanges, athletics, entertainment, recreation, and other problems incidental to those social services which go to make a person feel at ease while he is away from home. In every regiment there is a designated person whose sole task is to provide and organize recreational activities sufficient for every man in the regiment. This is a great advance over past procedure.

The next step is to see that these posts are filled by people who are just as rigorously and carefully selected and trained in their special fields as are officers in any other branch of the service. The navy has recognized this by calling from civilian life people who have had training and successful experience in recreational work.

When on leave, the soldier and sailor go to town. The recreation program within the army and navy posts must, therefore, be supplemented by community activities. A heavy burden is placed on cities, towns and villages near these new concentrations of armed forces. Many of them have gone through very difficult times. When the men were called up for service, army camps had to be built, the barracks, mess hall, hospital and recreation centers. While construction was still going on in the camps, badly bogged down in the mud of early spring, the soldiers moved in. The towns had not only to meet the needs of construction gangs, but to provide

for raw recruits as well. When the construction men got out and the mud dried up, soldiers in increasing numbers sought release from army training in near-by communities. Sidewalks were jammed, eating places overcrowded. I have stood with these men outside restaurants where only two or three at a time were admitted, and there was no place else to go in town where these men could even find a place to sit down.

These communities have come gallantly to the rescue, making available whatever resources they had. Park benches were bought by the hundreds. Musty front parlors, seldom used except on state occasions, were opened to welcome the soldiers. The shopkeepers enlarged their stock to meet the needs of their new customers. I wish I could tell you what these boys bought on Mother's Day. Their concept of what a mother would like was an eye opener, undoubtedly to the mothers and most certainly to the shopkeepers. The churches welcomed these service men and the soldiers preached and sang in the choirs and filled the pews. In Wadesboro, N. C., the Methodist Church raised locally \$600 for the entertainment of soldiers. That is a great deal of cash for a small southern town. The soldiers practically took the church over. Their full-voiced singing gave new vigor to familiar hymns. The congregation, out in full to meet the soldiers, took them home for dinner after church. After it was all over, the pastor said, "that \$600 was well spent."

In order to meet this unprecedented situation, the towns had to learn how to organize for recreation activity. The Federal Security Agency was designated to aid in this process and the Recreation Section, with a staff of seventy field workers, was created for the pur-

pose. We help the towns to organize and they do the job. There is no substitute for the hospitality and recreation which the town itself supplies. No amount of imported recreation or imported hospitality is any substitute. The boys cannot be fooled: a town is either a good town for soldiers or it is not. And the factor in the situation which makes it a good town is the spirit of the people who are aware of the problem and who strain every effort and resource to meet it. The eager appreciation of the boys is reward in itself.

Our function is to give suggestions. We suggest to the storekeeper what and how much to have on hand. We tell the banks what demands for cash they will have to meet. We tell the preachers how churches in other communities are helping. It is a familiar sight to see the people coming out of church and taking the soldiers off to dinner with them. This is no cash transaction. It is not a donation to provide a meal for a soldier. This is "feet under the table." It is a woman in the kitchen, cooking and washing dishes for some other mother's son.

The maneuvers have had an important effect on the little towns of the South. When they were informed that they would have to prepare for the coming of the troops, they held town meetings. They took count of stock and tried to plan to fill the gaps to the best of their ability. One town, Whitmire, in South Carolina, collected \$150, which they decided to spend for bed ticking. The women stitched up mattress covers, and the Boy Scouts stuffed them with straw which the farmers brought in. Soon these pallets were neatly arranged, and when the men arrived they found the village schoolhouse turned into a dormitory. Another town raised money and bought out all the vacant hotel rooms which they put at the service of the soldiers.

Every town in the maneuver area set up showers, either at the school athletic field or elsewhere. Where they couldn't get enough plumbing equipment, they improvised. One town put up, in an alley between the police station and the firehouse, a long pipe, perforated at regular intervals. This was fastened to a fire hose and as many as 175 soldiers at a time could take showers here.

The other universal need was for a place to write home. Here again schools and churches opened their doors. Have you ever seen a 190-pound soldier sitting in a seat in a third-grade schoolroom trying to write home? The schools provided the space, the community or the United Service Organizations provided the stationery, and the post office improvised stamp counters to relieve the jam in the village post offices. As a result, these little towns have had a demonstration of how their facilities can be put to larger community uses.

The maneuvers have been a wonderful educational experience in mutual regard and mutual care. These people in the South have learned from the men, and the soldiers have gotten to love these towns. The towns were organized and ready to receive the men, and the soldiers appreciated what they found. Can you see all the letters going out all over the country telling friends and families back home about the family life here in these southern towns, about the warm places, the lighted places, the hospitable places? Then the families wrote back, and told those people in the South how grateful they were for their kindness to their boys. Don't you see these men coming back, after it is all over, visiting the towns they were in, renewing these acquaintances?

These men are getting their roots down into new

parts of the country in ways that are not possible for casual tourists, or for people traveling through a region for business or pleasure. The maneuvers have called forth the most heartening outpourings of spontaneous hospitality I have ever witnessed. And we see an impressive manifestation of personal concern for the well-being and good cheer of strangers, which grows out of the very heart of America's homes. It is the outward working of every family's concern for its own members, and of every family's readiness to identify itself with the great common purpose that today unites the entire nation. This is the stuff of national morale.

A special and difficult situation exists in the outlying military and naval bases; Iceland, Newfoundland, Alaska, Bermuda, Puerto Rico, Panama, Hawaii, and many others. Wherever our men have gone, we have sent staff recreation men to survey community conditions. The whole recreation problem in these areas is extremely difficult. We are providing buildings in near-by communities, adjusted to local needs. Who will eventually provide the personnel to staff these buildings is not yet determined. In some cases the local community organizes committees which assume this responsibility; in others it is the United Service Organizations. In any event, we are providing the buildings which will be centers for the service men when they are on leave.

The industrial areas are more difficult but no less important. Many people fail to recognize that providing recreation in these centers is absolutely necessary. They hear that the men are making big money. What does big money mean? It means buying power. But these men can't buy safety for their children in school and play. They can't buy a place for women to get

together. They can't buy community spirit. Often they can't even buy an ice cream soda or a movie ticket because the demand so far exceeds the supply, and the supply is reserved for old residents.

Some of the women living in these new defense towns have said that it was just like life in a concentration camp. They have not been able to develop any feeling of solidarity. They have no community ties—that kind of association we have tried to develop in our little neighborhoods in New York City. The near-by towns have been overwhelmed by the demands made upon them. They need help, and the new trailer communities and the people living in the Federal Housing Units need help. The large cities whose normal community activities are overburdened by a new increase of community problems arising from the sudden congestion of defense industries in their neighborhood also need help. A one-shift social service is totally inadequate to meet the needs of a three-shift industrial community.

Early in the defense program, we saw these problems, and clearly recognized that it is the responsibility of the Federal Security Agency to help meet the situation. Choosing five industrial centers with unusually difficult problems, we put them under the microscope to see what help was most needed. These were Detroit, Michigan; Utica, New York; Hartford, Connecticut; Delaware County, Pennsylvania; and Wichita, Kansas. We held a conference, and asked representatives of these communities to come prepared to put all the facts of their situation on the table, for careful examination by the whole group. As a catalytic agent, we asked some people from the outside to sit in with them to "force their growth." As a result of this laboratory experiment, they found that by stretching their imagination—and their funds—they could find new ways of meeting their emergency problems.

Simple concrete demonstrations were given of the possibilities for fuller co-operation between community agencies, for organizing committees to fill gaps where no work was being done, and for opening up the facilities of churches, schools, and other public and semi-public buildings. We also tried to find a formula whereby communities could induct the newcomers into their common life. Of primary importance in achieving these results is the organization of an over-all local community committee or council, through which every agency and individual who so wishes can find his place in the community program.

The wisdom distilled from the experience of these towns was made available to other communities. Although the problems in every given situation differ from those in every other, certain fundamentals of good community life emerge. We cannot expect men, and particularly women, to stay in towns where there isn't a "good life." We cannot expect a good life in any town without adequate provision for people's spare time. We cannot expect men to put in a long, hard day's work without equal opportunity for play.

The towns are helped in this job, not only by what the Federal Security Agency is able to do but also by the United Service Organizations incorporated by six national private welfare agencies—the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the National Catholic Community Service, the Jewish Welfare Board, the Salvation Army, and the Travelers Aid Association—the U.S.O. staffs and operates service clubs in towns that need help, under an agreement with the Federal Security Agency.

The housing problem has been a difficult one in defense communities all over the country. Everyone knows now that houses mean more than barracks. They must

include adequate provision for children to play and for adults to get together. We have followed somewhat the same procedure in dealing with housing as in analyzing recreation needs of industrial cities. We have taken certain towns where there were defense housing units and have tried to find a formula for the essentials and for procedures.

The great cities of America have problems and opportunities different from those of small defense communities or faraway places.

In New York City there is a very able and active Defense Recreation Committee. This Committee has given away thousands of theater tickets. Think of what this city has done for men who never before knew the theater. Thousands and thousands of men come here. They come from practically every place in the country and many of them have had their first taste of the creative art of the theater. You must have seen repercussions of this. The other night I tried to get some tickets for a theater and I stood behind a couple of service men who were taking their own money out of wallets in which not much more was left. They bought their two tickets to the theater.

But the play is coming into its own not alone in the high-priced theaters. Shows are produced on the stages of our high schools, through the courtesy of the Boards of Education and the Defense Commissions, so that the men in outlying posts can enjoy them. In one of these, Ezra Stone played the role he once played on Broadway. This is a thrilling new way to use our schools.

Other cities have just as effective, though somewhat different programs for defense activities. I like San Francisco's Hospitality House right down in the Civic Square. Labor contributed its services in building the

house, the materials were provided by the city, industrialists did the supervising, and the city's Recreation Division runs the building. Every day it is open. And every day at stated hours there is a 49-mile drive around San Francisco provided by volunteers. Each week a different women's club sponsors the program and provides food and dance partners. San Francisco hospitality is becoming famous in American history.

In Louisville, Kentucky, the community has taken over the Knights of Columbus building and made it a Service Men's Center under excellent management. Macon, Georgia, without any outside help, has organized a fine program. On a Saturday night, in Richmond, Virginia, you can see the armories filled with hundreds and hundreds of men, resting comfortably, peaceably. The American public can be sure that American towns, big and small, are making their contribution to the morale of the country through their generous hospitality.

It is impossible to enumerate what all the communities are doing, and it might leave only the impression that millions of men and women in our cities are very generous and glad to do something for the soldiers. But that would be only part of the story. The impressive and significant fact is that the men and women of the large cities are doing something tremendous not only for soldiers, but also for themselves. They are recapturing what the growing cities have taken away from so many of us—that feeling that they and their neighbors are one.

Through the years too many families have become preoccupied with making a living and of spending their income for their own benefit. Each has become more and more separated from all the surrounding families, even from the physical neighborhood itself in which

the home is located. Its concerns have spread out to the work places, to the schools where the children go, to the commercial recreation places, to personal friends in other parts of the city. In the growth of the city with its many advantages we have lost the community spirit traditional in villages and farm regions.

Since our defense program got under way, city people have rediscovered a neighborliness which promises to restore to millions of isolated persons their sense of "belonging." It is their first chance to realize that all of us really have something in common, that we can vastly increase our satisfaction and our courage by taking part in what does concern all of us. We may well hope that this awakening of community spirit, through the effort to make other people's sons feel at home among strangers, will continue after the emergency as a powerful force in carrying further the dream of democracy.

But this is only a beginning. Many of us are still suffering from an ancient tradition regarding the wickedness of enjoying life. Most of us have been brought up to feel that spending time at anything but useful work and religious exercises is somehow wicked. We do permit children to play, but even that is only a concession. When we allow that recreation may be useful for adults it is usually—as the word itself suggests—on the assumption that the indulgence re-creates their energies for more work. We are sometimes forced, however, to suspect that this kind of thinking is topsy-turvy. We may have to justify our hard work, and even our terrific fighting, as necessary for insuring the peace in which people are to enjoy living. At any rate, recreation in many different forms is just now a necessary condition for maintaining the morale and the fighting

efficiency of our armed forces and of the civilian population too.

What many have not realized before is that all over America, numberless communities are still in various stages of destitution in regard to recreation resources. These towns are hungry for the kind of program we are trying to help them have. One of our principles is not to let a town be split in this effort. A town must present a united front. Then out of this emergency effort—this organizing for the service of others—will come some of those things that we hope will be of lasting good: good community organization and genuine community solidarity.

Out of my experience in this nationwide community awakening, I have become more of a patriot and less of a cynic. I have come to know my own country better. If I still cannot define "democracy" and "morale" adequately, I can at least share with you my faith in this business of health and work and play, in good food and good houses. We can have all these in America. We can share these things. That is part of democracy, sharing what we have, sharing the commonwealth of this nation. This implies participation by all of us in the good life which is our heritage. By participation I do not mean merely casting a vote. Sometimes that may even be a travesty on democracy. I mean the opportunity for people to take an active part in the life of this nation.

I have said this before and I am going to say it again: We have a big army and navy, big unions, big industry, big government, but the flesh and blood of democracy is how people participate in all this. Not only in the cities, but in every town and hamlet, all the people have to play a part and feel that they belong.

That is the process out of which democracy comes, out of which unity comes.

Today there is a sense of a great national purpose which more than anything else will pull us together, resolve our conflicts and bring forth our capacity and power to achieve a better way of life. This is the dream of democracy. There is always something ahead, some goal. Out of this whole struggle must come those things that make for the good life. We will never attain that goal each by himself, each apart from the others or confined to his own thought.

The loss of freedom any place in the world hurts us here. Once we fought to assure that our nation should not be half slave and half free. Now we are in a long hard conflict with a great task ahead of us. This task is to see that the world in which we live is not half slave and half free.

I have no use for "recovery." I never want to go back to what we had in 1929. I want a new America, an America believing in and struggling for an energetic, aggressive democracy.

THE IMPACT OF THE DRAFT ON THE AMERICAN FAMILY

by

Brigadier-General Lewis B. Hershey

WE ARE asked to consider the impact of the draft on the American family. If by the term "impact" is meant a blow in the catastrophic sense, then it may be said with considerable conviction that, until now, the impact has been slight. Practically every man who has been inducted into the armed forces through Selective Service came from a family, and that family has been more or less poignantly affected by his departure. But when we weigh the quality of that effect no sophistry or straining at words is required to conclude that the sum total to now has been good and not evil. The family suffers inconvenience, no doubt, and grief over separation. Financial sacrifice is often entailed. Anxiety puts its mark on those left at home and this will grow with the fateful march of events. But these considerations are matched usually by moral values which accrue to that family, strengthening it and enriching it as it comes to a renewed and more vivid consciousness of its place in the national life and its part in the great events which impend. That son who has gone forth to prepare for defense of the country becomes now something more than a casual youngster, taken for granted. His common clay is charged now with a new and more precious meaning for those at home. He carries to camp the banner of that family in his heart. Here is a quick-

ening of national life, a close contact with the spirit of Democracy, a livelier sense of its meaning and the dangers which threaten it.

Separation is not necessarily disruption. Since family life began men have gone forth from their families; down to the sea in ships, to far countries in search of fortune, to the wars. The family carries on, often becoming more closely knit as it waits and plans the return of its fathers and sons and husbands. Such separations frequently are endured for lesser reasons than defense of country.

It is not contended that the draft has not affected profoundly the American family. To a people emerging from the privations and stresses of a world-wide depression this new call for sacrifice must necessarily have presented disturbing and even terrifying prospects—prospects now verging upon reality. That they have accepted it on the whole with equanimity and fortitude is the best proof possible of the underlying unity of America. We know now that there was no real clash in American feeling, no deep dispute over what it was America seeks to preserve, no matter how resounding or bitter the debate as to how it should be preserved. The mass of Americans were neither interventionist nor isolationist. They share a dream in common and now they will see to it that the dream is not shattered.

The Selective Service Act of 1940, though passed in the shadow of war, was, during its first year of operation, a peacetime training act. And because it was created in peacetime and operated until December 8, 1941, without the impetus of actual war, Selective Service, 1940 model, faced problems in some way greater than those of Selective Service, 1917-1918 model, despite the vast debt of experience it owed to those earlier years. Never before had the nation sought

to set its house in order on so large a scale in anticipation of an approaching storm. It was the effort of a somewhat stoop-shouldered Democracy to galvanize itself into action—to lift itself by its own coat collar at a time when to many Americans the issue was not yet clearly defined, however brightly it flamed across the sky for most of us. There was need of education—of shibboleths even—in those first days, to point the way—the terrible way that we must go.

Selective Service began with some misgivings. It was a thing by which men were to be made to take up the duties which were theirs, but which their somewhat bewildered eyes had not yet recognized. That time is past. The encrusted scales of many petty years of peace have fallen. Today Selective Service is the institution through which Americans assume their duty ungrudgingly, intelligently and even eagerly. It has become the forge where men find ready to their hands the weapons best suited to their abilities, the means by which the patriotic urge is translated into effective action. And because of its intimate contact with the lives of all the people it has become a potent force in shaping the purposes of the nation, the lens to focus the vision of the nation. Today it welds the sword that will preserve the nation.

The American family is the nation. What it thinks and does is the expression of the national will. It sends its men to camp to serve no grandiose purpose of conquest. It pools its precious liberties only to preserve a way of life in which men may live and breathe without terror, and work out their own small destinies in their own way. That has been America. That will be America when the storm is over.

One of the most impressive characteristics of the

Selective Service Act and the regulations under which it has been administered is that such elaborate precautions have been taken to safeguard the industrial and social welfare of the nation. It is reflected throughout, and was, in fact, the very spirit of the act, subject only to the primary purpose, which was to increase the armed forces. The local boards kept it steadfastly in mind and the success of Selective Service during its peacetime training phase was due in large measure to the fact it was never lost sight of by the men who administer the Act.

Today, with the nation fighting for its life, Selective Service finds no need to abandon that basic principle. It must, however, apply the principle in the light of changed and existing conditions, bearing in mind the over-all picture of man-power needs and man-power procurement. Dependency and occupational necessity as the basis for deferment from the armed forces are relative terms, their meaning flexible and to be determined by the national interest at the time of their application. But the underlying principle remains the same—selection and allocation of man power in the national interest.

Back in the days when the plans for Selective Service were being developed strenuous efforts were made to weed from its nomenclature the word "draft." Emphasis was put upon "Selection for Service"—the assignment of men to the jobs where they could serve the nation best. But this was to little avail. Once the act passed, back came "the draft" and "draft" it has remained for most of us, despite the readily apparent fact that drafting men for the training camps was one of the lesser preoccupations of the system during its first year of operation. Then the machine turned primarily to keep men from the camps and to preserve

for industry and agriculture—and the home—the men needed there in the national interest. Scarcely 10 per cent of the registrants who were classified in that peacetime period were made available for the armed forces. Nearly 70 per cent were deferred because of dependents—because of the family.

This will not always be so. The outbreak of war has made necessary a regearing of the machine, a revaluation of man-power needs with the requirements of the armed forces and the war production program paramount to civilian and social needs. Deferments are provisional and temporary and it will become necessary to withdraw many of them in the national interest. The American family should hold this fact in mind as it charts its way through the great emergency. What seemed a hardship yesterday today becomes a necessary sacrifice in the service of the country.

In the beginning local boards were admonished almost prayerfully to consider the necessity for the maintenance of the family unit in the national interest—to remember the harm that may result from separating a father from his children, a husband from his wife. They were told to resolve all doubtful cases in favor of the registrant and his dependents. Most of them did so.

But the hard fact remains that the Selective Service law says in painfully literal words that men may be deferred on dependency grounds only if they are found to have persons dependent upon them in fact for support—dependent upon the earnings of the registrant in a business, occupation or employment.

The problem of deferment for dependency involves the most vital function of the local boards. They must necessarily exercise a wide discretion, deciding each case by itself and avoiding any easy or universal rule. From the beginning National Headquarters has re-

frained from all attempts to limit this discretion by any hard and fast interpretations. It is recognized that the complexities of human life are such that no two cases are exactly identical no matter how much they may seem to be on the surface. Apparent inconsistencies in local board decisions, and what may appear to be discrimination, usually dissolve when the facts are known. More often than not the facts governing the decision are known only to the local board and the registrant and in many cases are confidential under the law and may not be disclosed. The local board acts on knowledge of the circumstances which may clearly distinguish one case from another, no matter how similar they may appear to others.

Nor is it natural to suppose that all of 6,500 local boards throughout the whole breadth of the country, living in and dealing with widely differing conditions of life, should see eye to eye even in identical cases, nor bring the same philosophy to bear upon their decisions. America is not yet cast in so rigid a mold. Selective Service has been built upon the theory of decentralized administration, with the local boards the sole judges of the facts, subject to appeal; and if some degree of lack of uniformity has resulted from that decentralization it has been a small price to pay for the manifest benefits of having Selective Service operated by the people and each man judged by his neighbors.

I am not unduly impressed by the complaint that there has been a lack of uniformity in dependency deferments. Uniformity is a comforting yardstick but it may be of doubtful value in dispensing justice in such an undertaking as Selective Service. There is only relative uniformity in the decisions of our courts, the acts of our legislatures and the administration of our local governments. It is a thing not to be guaranteed by rules

nor by patterns into which men are supposed to fit. You could get absolute uniformity no doubt by means of those miraculous statistical cards which would show which class a man belonged in according to the number of holes in his card which correspond with the holes in some master card. But then you would not need any local boards nor anything except a machine operating in Washington. Even so, a reasonable degree of uniformity is recognized as desirable and is sought after. National Headquarters keeps a fairly steady flow of memoranda to the various State Headquarters designed to effect whatever degree of uniformity is found essential, or to correct such instances of lack of uniformity as may threaten morale.

The liberal appeal provisions of Selective Service furnish adequate opportunity for redress of local board decisions believed by the registrant to be unjust; and as the body of opinions and decisions of the appeal boards grows it tends to bring about greater uniformity by its effect upon the thinking and the philosophy of the local boards.

The most perplexing problems that plagued the local boards were: What to do with married men where economic dependency was not clearly established, as in the case of men with working wives; and what to do with men recently married. The law said nothing about marriage, old or new. The Congress, apparently deliberately, refrained from recognizing the marital state, by itself, as a cause for deferment. Nor did the law or the regulations, at first, impose any time limit beyond which a registrant may not assume the support of dependents without losing his eligibility for deferment.

From the beginning two schools of thought developed on the first question. Some local boards took the position that dependency in fact upon the earned in-

come of the registrant without any other consideration must exist before deferment can be made. Other boards held that the definition of dependency had a wider application, especially as applied to the head of the family, and that considerations other than financial could be weighed. The registrant whose wife works and helps financially to maintain the home presented a special puzzle to the boards. What constituted a substantial contribution to a dependent? What degree of hardship was the board justified in imposing upon the wife who helped with the family expenses? How far should a family reduce its standards of living in order to contribute one of its members to the armed forces? It was not an easy task and no rules could make it so.

The attitude of the local boards toward the newly married registrant varied at first all the way from complete exclusion of his claim for deferment to broad acceptance of the inevitability of marriage and of the dependency of a wife, no matter how, when or why acquired. One appeal board laid down the principle that marriages after the date of the fall of France should not be recognized on the ground that that catastrophe was notice enough to Young America of the dangers confronting his country and his prior obligations to serve it. Others adopted as a deadline the date of the passage of the law, or the date of registration.

The increased rate of marriages among registrants has compelled National Headquarters to take steps to restrict the use of marriage as a means of evading the obligation to serve in the armed forces. Since the beginning, Selective Service has attempted to protect the home from the unnecessary removal of the husband and father. It is now faced with the problem of defending the home and the family against those who would use these institutions as a means for evading military serv-

ice. Selective Service must view with alarm the use of the establishment of homes on the insecure basis of evasion. During the past policies have been announced from National Headquarters which place upon the registrant the burden of proof that he did not marry to evade the obligations of military service.

Since the outbreak of war regulations have been adopted specifically defining the position of registrants who have married recently. These provide that no registrant shall be deferred in Class III-A if he acquired a status with respect to dependency on or after September 16, 1940, and before December 8, 1941, unless he convinces his local board that his status was not voluntarily acquired at a time when his selection was imminent, or for the purpose of providing himself with a claim for deferment. (The first date is that of the passage of the Act and the second date is that of the Declaration of War.) It is provided further that if a registrant acquired such a status after December 8, 1941, he shall not be deferred unless he is able to convince the local board that such status was acquired under circumstances which were beyond his control.

Selective Service will continue to defer those individuals industry must have to produce the materials necessary to equip our forces—ground, sea and air. Men will be deferred to insure an adequate supply of food. Students will continue their studies when by so doing they become trained for professions in which there is scarcity. Apprentices will continue to acquire skills, skills in which there are shortages. The man with actual dependents who are supported by his earned income will continue to be deferred. The future of this nation depends upon the family.

There will be enough man power for all purposes, provided every man, woman and child does his share.

There must not, dare not be any shirking of duty. All must work. There cannot be avenues by which men evade their responsibilities. No profession, no skill, no occupation, no industry shall become the refuge of slackers. Every American family must have come by now to know that the time is past when it may cherish first its rights and privileges. The time has come to look to the foundations of freedom on which those rights and privileges rest, lest they be blown forever away by the blast of ruthless forces loosed in the world today.

Selective Service has come far from the days of its beginning. It knows itself now, and is strong; *it* has been deep into the heart of America and it knows the source of its strength. Not for small things have these millions of young Americans brought to a common scale, for a common judging, all the intimate circumstances of their lives. They will save America.

And behind them stands the American family. I said before that separation is not disruption. Each man called from a family goes to serve that family and to protect it. All men hoped for peace. War has come, actual war, with death and blood its companions. The American family will not falter nor dissolve. Certainly all draft men know that from its devoted hearths the stream of America's man power will flow steadily, unforced, to the training camps of victory.

THE TOLL OF INTOLERANCE UPON THE INTOLERANT

by

David M. Levy, M.D.

I WISH to consider here the particular influences that shape a personality permeated with hostile attitudes. By hostile attitudes I mean all the attacking attitudes expressed in sarcasm, derogatory remarks, barbed wit, insulting rejoinders. I refer to all the manifestations of hate in words or deeds or gesture. By the phrase, "a personality permeated with hostile attitudes," I mean an individual of whom one or another manifestation of hate is especially characteristic.

Since hostility is a normal expression of human personality, we might attempt to differentiate all people by the amount of hostility they display. One could go on and determine how much of the individual energy is absorbed in the task of hating. Such studies are not available. Their lack, however, is not at all serious for our purpose. We are dealing with people easily differentiated, in the main, from the common run, with people who are typically hostile, with people who, as the saying goes, are full of hate.

Intolerant people are people who hate. Their degree of intolerance is a measure of their hate. When a person is characteristically intolerant, he belongs to the group of the psychologically hostile, whose features I shall attempt to describe. The most distinctive finding among the psychologically hostile is a stultification of the per-

sonality. In a well-known personality test such individuals, for whom hatred is so vital a function, are found to be characterized by a marked *narrowing* of the thought, feelings, and imagination. The generalization applies equally well to the haters who have repressed their hate and to those who express it directly, in words or action. The technical name applied to this process of narrowing is *coarctation*, which means restriction or choking down, as of a tube.

Many avenues of experience are closed off to the haters. As the Swiss pastor Oscar Pfister put it, "*das Hassen ist lebensfeindlich*"—hate is inimical to life. There is less awareness of what is going on. The hater tends to divert all experiences into a channel of hate.

The intellectual functions are narrowed because they become so specialized. They are employed in building up accusations, in constantly proving the presence of the enemy, in interpreting his every act or expression into further grounds for hostility, into a stubborn self-defense and justification. The logical faculties are employed in creating a special dialectic of hate.

Feelings of human sympathy, kindness, geniality, become warped. The receptive and creative functions in human relationships suffer. Suspicion replaces acceptance. For the eye of hostility, as it focusses more and more into social activity, finally sees only danger and destruction.

Ideas become stereotyped. The accusations and justifications are labored. It is as though the haters, however they elaborate the phrase, are saying the same thing over and over again. There are, of course, great differences in intelligence among the haters, as among other groups. But the differences are not of essentials. They are seen chiefly in the cleverness of the phrase, in

the accumulation of details, in the intricacies of plots and suspicions.

The suspicious, attacking attitudes are associated with alertness and restlessness. The hostile eye must be forever open. Too many dangers are abroad. The haters who express their hostility openly are tireless individuals. Their organic energies are mobilized by their hate. The normal friendly person whose hate is episodic or limited to particular individuals is, by comparison, phlegmatic. The active haters are alert, restless, industrious. The phrase "consumed by hate" may be literally true. For some individuals, as psychiatrists are well aware, pay the price of their hate in physical distress and illness.

So far I have attempted to draw a picture of the "anatomy" of hate—a description of its constricting effects on the personality, its narrowing influence on intellectual functions, its warping of emotional life, and the energizing of activity by the force of hostility.

I would now like to refer to the physiology of hate, to a study of the process in action, to a study of its psychodynamics.

Of the dynamics of hate, most important is the anxiety that engenders it. Anxiety is its core. The anxiety is the troublemaker of the personality. It may be a universal rule that hostile acts or thoughts carry in their wake the fear of reprisals, of retaliation, and a feeling of guilt—which latter amounts to a fear of punishment for the sin of hating. The anxiety that leads to hostile attitudes thereby creates further anxiety. The feeling of guilt is very disturbing. It must be constantly mollified. The hater, disturbed by his conscience, must prove to himself that his hate is most fully justified.

One process of justifying this hate consists of magnification. The hater builds up the evil aspects of the object of hate. Starting with simple exaggeration he may expand the process into fantastic dimensions, depending on the severity of his illness. Since his hate is disproportionate to the object, he must fit the object to his feeling. He must keep fabricating something for his hate to feed on. Otherwise he is unable to justify his hate, and anxiety increases.

A second process has to do with the minutiae of hate. It consists in finding proof of evil in every little detail, in misrepresenting every aspect of the hated object. Justification of hostile attitudes by exaggeration and distortion are common enough in everyday life. The difference between the hater and the normal is originally one of degree. The hater employs the same methods at first, only more frequently and intensively.

A child who is ill disposed toward a teacher may, from the moment the hostile attitudes begin, completely lose the objectivity he previously had in that relationship. The teacher's foibles are exaggerated; her actions are misinterpreted. What was previously a smile is now seen as a sneer. Her praise of another is a sign of favoritism. The marks she gives are proof of unfairness.

Among normal adults likewise there is a tendency to reduce the good and expand the bad aspects of the persons they hate, besides a certain amount of distortion. Your friend, for example, may hate Miss Jones. In a conversation Miss Jones happens to talk about an incident in college. The incident seems a perfectly natural part of the conversation to you, but your friend regards it as something dragged in, in order to humiliate her because she did not go to college.

I am sure that all of us are able to think of further

illustrations. For the real hater, however, this type of misinterpretation runs amok. The slightest remark, the most unrelated event, may be given the significance of a sinister plot. As hostility becomes more intensified—and so more abnormal—we see increasing resort to exaggerations, distortions, misrepresentations. The personality develops a paranoid coloring, and when this process reaches full bloom, becomes definitely delusional. There is a long road between ordinary intolerance and the picture of Hitler-madness which I have presented. Nevertheless, in any highly intolerant person you will see an unduly suspicious person. You may recognize the paranoid coloring.

Of the dynamics of hate I have, so far, dwelt on the activation of the hater by his sense of guilt. I have tried to show how it leads him to distort the object by seeing it with a telescope or a microscope—never with normal vision. The hater is motivated also by fears of retaliation, by fear of the revengeful attitude which, he assumes, his hate inspires in the enemy. The justification of his hostility acts like a two-edged sword, for by magnifying the enemy, he magnifies the power of retaliation. The object of hate thus becomes more hateful, more powerful, and more dangerous. The hater is preoccupied in creating Frankenstein's monsters. That may be the explanation for a certain type of hater, whose anxiety is allayed only in the process of attacking; as though he felt that, if he ever stops, the enemy would be upon him. He becomes enslaved by his own destructive impulses.

The release of primitive hostile impulses is so dangerous to human welfare that every measure is taken to curb it. The process of taming the savage within us begins in early infancy. If we have gone no farther

along the line of attack than to be petty, or nasty, or irritable, we feel bound of necessity to apologize, to make amends, to wipe out the bad behavior. We want to be restored, in the same way as a child wants to be restored to the love of his mother, when she has punished, or scolded, or manifested nothing more critical than a disapproving look. When we make a definite attack with words or muscles we feel a certain gratification in relieving our feelings, in, if you wish, releasing aggression. But then we feel the need to make amends all the more strongly. Otherwise we may really become depressed. In children we see that process more clearly.

Two boys "have it in" for each other. They have been exchanging insults for weeks. Finally the crisis comes. They resolve their hostile feelings in a fist fight. After the fight they may become friendly. In the fight both have relieved their aggression. Their friendship represents a restoring function. In fact, a number of friendships develop in just that way. This process of restoring, of "making up," represents a definite reparative principle, a healing, in human relationship. But somehow this principle does not operate with the real hater. His hostility is never spent. It is constantly seething. The period of elation that takes place after the attack is quickly dissipated and the restoring function is crippled.

Another process that follows the attack is referred to as "self-punishment." We see it in adult life chiefly in the form of self-admonition, self-appraisal, and self-debasement. Reparation, self-punishment, and self-justification are natural sequences of hostile behavior. I have tried to show that the abnormality in self-justification is in the process of magnification and distortion of the object of hate. I have indicated also the crippling effect of chronic hate on the reparative

or restoring function. In regard to self-punishment, its pathology is seen in the form of severe and constant self-admonition, verbal abuse, and even suicide. Among the psychologically hostile, suicidal trends are common.

Restoring, justifying, self-punishing are processes that operate not merely to attain equilibrium for the individual. They act also as deterrents or brakes on the impulse to hate. By anticipation, they help strengthen inhibitions to the act. One can see, therefore, how a preacher of hate, or how the inculcation of an ideology of hate, can break down normal psychological structures and bring about a diseased personality. For the justification is furnished in the ideology, self-appraisal is surrendered, and the need of making amends—the corrective of injustice, the constructive phase of the process, is no longer felt. Hate is perverted. Its brakes and barriers are destroyed. Conscience no longer operates.

The disseminator of intolerance, operating on the fertile soil of the psychologically hostile, may initiate an epidemic of hate, as readily comprehensible as an epidemic of typhoid fever. The source of either epidemic, whether of typhoid or of hate, would be considered equally dangerous and criminal, if public understanding of mental health were at all effective.

I have attempted to present a picture of certain common phases of normal and abnormal hate. However glaring the end product in the disease of hate appears, you will find the intolerant somewhere along the line, nearer to or farther from the normal base, depending upon how deep the inroads which hostile feelings have made upon the personality. The intolerant individuals, like the more severe haters, may be injurious members of society or of any smaller group; but

the hostile attitudes result in incalculable suffering to the victim of what may be fairly considered a disease.

This description of the hater and of the dynamics of hating we can apply to various forms of strain and conflict, whether within a society, or even a single family, at one extreme or among entire peoples or nations at the other.*

*Some of the larger omissions in this study should be mentioned. I have not included sadistic hate (hostile acts or feelings primarily associated with sexual pleasure) nor the sadistic elements in normal hate. The mild chronic intolerants have also been omitted: they represent every variety of snobbery used to bolster up inadequacies. I have omitted the mild irascibles who are constantly discharging into family life various quanta of hostility displaced from school, office, or factory where the manifestations of hatred or intolerance are inhibited.

Of the mechanisms, I have omitted, among others, the diminution of the individual's anxiety through his identification with like-minded hostile groups and leaders, and I have not considered at all the factors that bring about the posture distinctive of the hating personality.

UNITY IN DIVERSITY

by

Everett R. Clinchy

THIS country is a family of many national, racial, and religious groups. To read the list of the people who make up the United States is to state a problem. We are one-third of a million Indian; one-third of a million Oriental, Filipino, Mexican; 60 million Anglo-Saxon; 10 million Irish; 15 million Teutonic; 9 million Slavic; 5 million Italian; 4 million Scandinavian; 2 million French; 13 million Negro; 1 million each, Finn, Lithuanian, Greek.

In addition our national structure is complicated by religious differences. We Americans are 2 million Anglican-Episcopalian; 40 million Protestant; 1 million Greek Catholic; 4½ million Jew; two-thirds of a million Mormon; 22 million Roman Catholic; one-half million Christian Scientist. And these people of these varying cultures, with all their differences, are trying to live together.

We are attempting to forge out of many nationalities one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. The history of America indicates that we have tried to make various adjustments from time to time, not always successfully. Look back over the past one hundred years and you will discover that families and schools and churches apparently have ignored the need for education necessary to enable us to live in a country characterized by such cultural many-ness. We have

had secret societies galore, like the Know-Nothing Movement, the American Protective Association, and the Ku Klux Klan. Parents and teachers of children have not solved the problem of intercultural relations because they have not definitely faced it. Prejudice, persecution, and hate hysterias have been common enough; but like other common facts of life, they have been taboo subjects. Many, even today, look at intercultural education in the old-fashioned way that we used to look at sex education.

The nation's program of military defense includes detailed measures for sanitation and protection of the physical health of its armed forces. It goes without saying, however, that the civilian population has not yet been taught to make their homes as immune to the infection of "hate" as they have learned to make them sanitary against the infection of physical disease. American mothers pride themselves that this nation's families are the world's largest consumers of soap and disinfectants. On the other hand, is it not true, that many American mothers unwittingly expose their children to infections of prejudice and hatred within the family circle, which may develop chronic mental and emotional ailments?

The existence of the religious and racial cultures of forty-six old-world nationalities in the United States offers a fertile field for the germs of totalitarian hate propaganda. Every American family should be made alive to the menace of the "hate virus." Unfortunately, Americans have not yet learned to treat in their homes the problem of prejudice, either realistically or scientifically.

For a hundred and fifty years we have been obliged, in this country, to adjust the relations to one another of the various national, racial, and religious groups

that constitute our citizenship. And we have sought, more or less deliberately, to forge national unity out of our cultural diversity. But we have avoided causes of difficulty, as though we were running away from reality. Our attitude toward all the various "hate" movements that have blotted our history has been pre-scientific. We have not applied to our everyday relations with other groups of people the knowledge which biologists, psychologists, anthropologists, sociologists, and historians have accumulated. But this lag between knowledge and practice is no longer excusable. Today, science has established beyond doubt that chronic hate is an abnormality, and, when carried to extremes, a disease, with destructive effects upon the organism that harbors it, mental, emotional and physical.

Hatred, moreover, is a communicable disease, as Dr. Levy points out in his paper. It is disseminated by carriers. Hate orators, hate publishers, hate organizers are as serious a menace as typhoid carriers. The community needs to take prophylactic measures both mental and physical against such dangers. They should be hospitalized. The time will come when boards of health will isolate for medical care the abnormal persons who spread the ills that impair the emotional, mental and physical health of the public, just as we quarantine the victims of scarlet fever or smallpox.

I have just come from England where, at the beginning of the war, there was a great deal of trouble between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Hatred and overt conflicts were artificially stimulated, mainly by the enemy from without. Then, the agents and the dupes of the troublemakers were discovered, with a man named Moseley in the leadership. A choice was given to the fascists either to hush up or to live for the duration on the Isle of Man. Moseley and his

cohorts of psychopathic cases were isolated—and the bottom dropped out of the hate trouble in England. Since then, a degree of unity has been achieved among the various religious cultures in that troubled island that they never knew before.

The important job in family education for better human relations is at once an intellectual and an emotional responsibility, to be geared with the schools and the churches. Let us think in terms of immunizing people against this disease of intolerance. A first essential is to immunize by teaching people the facts—the intellectual approach. That is psychiatrically sound. If we familiarize the youngsters with the truth about the various peoples who make up this country of ours, and they really know the facts, intelligence and appreciation will mark their dealings with people who vary from their own appearance or from their particular way of life.

Along with the factual, rational approach, we must attend also to emotional education. The psychologists call this "emotional conditioning." That means giving our youngsters experiences with people of other nationality backgrounds, with people of other racial strains and religious persuasions. In this way they will have warm, satisfying, friendly, and happy associations with people of other groups. As we make it possible for our schools and churches and our families to introduce the youngsters of each group to the youngsters of another group in a way that creates emotional satisfaction, we carry out the second part of the morale job that is necessary for living in a country characterized by cultural diversity.

One thing more: We need to hold before our youth some great goal, and that goal is at hand. The goal is to make the American Way really work, and to become

missionary-minded in sharing the American Idea with the rest of the world. American youths can be very proud of the great experiment that is going on in America. What is this experiment? It is the adventure of sons and daughters of all of the old-world peoples living together on one continent, to create one nation of many nationalities, including all racial strains and all religious persuasions.

We have in this country of ours a Declaration of Independence for everyone. We have a Constitution with a Bill of Rights promising freedom of the human mind and freedom of the human soul, with freedom of worship for every living child. This idea, now, is the central characteristic of the American nation as the world today conceives it. This American idea can be made to work in Europe. Europe, too, may become one nation of many nationalities with liberty and justice for all.

There is coming, inescapably, an earthwide union of the people of the globe: economically all of the nations are interdependent now. This war is simply a method of determining whether the earthwide political union is to be a free association of people or an enslaved unity of the world. God grant that it may be the free society of free people of all nationalities and all racial strains and all religious fellowships: It will be, if the central idea of the American Dream prevails.

Youth will respond to the challenge of this ideal. Let us not be afraid to say to the youth of this country that the future will have for them elements of risk, danger, and of sacrifice; it promises to be dynamic, interesting, exciting and rewarding.

AT HOME IN THE WORLD

by

Pearl S. Buck

WHEN I began to write this our nation was not yet at war. I put down then as my first words this axiom: the parents should not live for the child. Now that war has been declared, and the call comes to everyone to plunge into the struggle, I do not change that axiom but I add to it these words—neither should the child be left deserted in the home.

I believe that there is an enormous waste in this matter of living for the child. Generations waste themselves thus. Of what use is it merely to produce children and devote the adult life to their care only to have them in their turn produce more children and they devote themselves again? Is this treadmill of more production of human beings of any meaning? I cannot see that it is. Each generation should rather live its own life and leave behind it a definite achievement for the race as a whole. It would be a better heritage for the child than merely to have brought him to being and clothed and fed and given him what we call an education. An education is of very little worth unless the individual can use it and add to it the meaning of his own life.

We are of course in a transition period. In every country I dare say the problem of home in relation to life is the same. Life has suddenly changed everywhere. The confines of a community are no longer a single

town, or even a single nation. The community has suddenly become the whole world, and world problems impinge upon the humblest of us. I think of a boy I know, reared in the smallest and quietest of Pennsylvania towns near where I live. He was reared of course for the environment his parents know—the only one they will ever know. Yet a few weeks ago he was plucked up out of the little village and sent to another state and now he is in the Philippines.

It is impossible, therefore, in one sense, for parents to prepare their children for life—certainly impossible if they themselves think and move only in small village ways. Yet it is essential that today parents force themselves to live in the larger world in which their children must one day live. A generation ago parents could prepare their children for a small comfortable world. If the occasional child wandered beyond that, he was the unusual one, and it would have been foolish to prepare all children for the life only the runaway and the adventurous child would live.

But this is not true today. Today the world is close to every home. The Orient is a few days away from our boundaries. Europe is a matter of overnight. Nor are these physical distances shorter than the mental and spiritual contacts which they enforce upon us. We must know for our own preservation what the truth is about other countries and other peoples. It is as important for us today to know what India thinks about England as it used to be to know the politics of a neighbor. In our children's lifetime we will see India and England either come to terms or to grief and in ways which will inevitably involve our children. It will not do to raise our children in a small tight compartmented world any more. We do them an injustice and we may even en-

danger their lives some day by not fitting them for their home in the world.

My one criticism of the American home, therefore, is that it is too much a place of refuge and not sufficiently a place of education for life. Now it may be argued that we need a place of refuge. Yes, we do, but no one should live in a place of refuge unless possibly he is very old or invalid. A child especially must not grow up in a place of refuge or he will never be able to live happily anywhere else. Home must have its hours of refuge, its periods of vacation, its moods of recreation. But man, woman and child should not feel when they enter the doors of home that they leave the world outside. The person who thinks of home as a refuge is the person who has not learned to enjoy life and who has not found his place in life. If he wants to escape the world, it is sure sign that he has never developed into an adult. And the fault for this lack of development is to be found, I believe, primarily in the home.

Let me state my thesis boldly. I believe that the home should be consciously a part of the world, a place where world problems are faced and talked about, discussed and understood, and acted upon, where there is a sense of true responsibility for such action—above all, where nothing is hidden from a child. I do not mean that knowledge should be forced upon a child. I mean that the atmosphere of a home should not be kept muted and softened to any child, but that every interest should be kept quick and alive. Let the parents talk about whatever is going on in the world, what they hear over the radio and what they read in the newspapers and all that goes on and must go on in their minds if they are living in the world and not in hiding. The child will hear some of it and understand a little of it, and

forget the rest of it. When he asks questions answer them briefly and simply. There is nothing which cannot be put into a few simple quick words which will be enough for the little child. And how good it is for him to know that though he is thoroughly loved and well taken care of, yet his parents are interested in many things beside him! Whenever I hear a woman whose conversation is altogether of what her children do and say, I feel sorry for those children. How can they go out and live happily in a world of which they are not the center? It is a bad thing for anybody at any time in his life to feel that he is the center of any world. Home ought to be a living unit in a living world, and not a hole into which to crawl to escape the realities of life.

The realities of life—how many of us when we hear that phrase see things sordid and sad and dreary! If we do, it is because somewhere long back in childhood our parents tried to shield us from the realities. They tried, in their kind and loving ignorance, to spare us, and instead they deprived us. For the realities are what we want, what we must have if as individuals we are to grow to our full stature. The child ought early to know that it is within his ability to be a good man, because some men are bad. He ought to value life because there is also death. He must learn how to keep healthy because there is also sickness. He must see sorrow in order to know that there is also joy. He must find out that certain ways lead to grief but others lead to happiness. To delay such knowledge is to defraud the child of years of his life, to waste time when he ought to be living fully as an adult in learning the lessons he ought to have absorbed as a child out of the very atmosphere of his home.

The realities of life are not sad or dreary. Life is good to the very last drop, and evil and sorrow and

grief are part of the whole. For the person whose home has been a part of the world the balance is never afterwards wrong. He will never be hopeless or despairing because he knows from the moment that he knows anything that there are evil and sorrow as there are also good and happiness, and he is not frightened as he would be if for all his childhood years he had been taught that real life was happiness and plenty and then found out that it is not. The anxiety with which so many of us face life and live life comes from the longing to get back into what we were taught as children, that happiness is the normal, the real atmosphere—that plenty and safety and security are to be expected. The truth is that nothing in life can be expected—the joy of living is to take what comes and fight against it or accept it—but live, and not try all the time to escape living and get away into some romantic refuge where everything ends happily.

But how actually, in a practical fashion, is the home to be brought into the current of life?

I must answer this as best I can, partly out of experience, partly from observation. My own childhood home was far from perfect, I realize, as an environment for a child. But with all its imperfections I can never be grateful enough that it was not a refuge. It was a regular whirlpool of cross currents from all over the world. My parents were only secondarily parents. I know my mother loved her children with all her heart but certainly she never loved us with all her time. But we shared everything with her. She took us to her religious meetings and we went with her when she dispensed food and money to the poor and we helped her with her clinics and her housekeeping equally. We were pressed into every sort of service—not in her case for any obvious training of us, but simply because she had

to have help. She was deeply involved in life and she involved us with her. We were early familiar with the sight of hunger and death and we knew because we had heard them the life problems of our surroundings.

The result was that without knowing it I grew up hating sorrow and hardship but not afraid of either. I learned so early how to look on death that I cannot remember horror at a dead face. By the time I was grown a lot of the clutter of childhood was out of the way and without personal pain or even knowledge that I was learning I had learned what life is.

What our parents gave us, too, was a sense of responsibility toward the world. We did not merely learn, we learned that we had something to do with all we learned—that nothing human was alien to us, because we, too, were human. We learned this not by hearing it said, but simply by seeing our parents deeply involved in action. They were so interested in what they did that they made themselves interesting to us. We were not left outside of their activities or left to ourselves while they came and went—we came and went, too. Yes, we saw things and did things that many of us here would not consider suitable for children—I can only say that I am thankful for everything I was allowed to do and to see and to share as a child. I came to my adulthood ready for life and I have enjoyed it all, good and bad. None of it has been too much, neither its sorrow nor its good. For this I must thank my parents, who let the life of the world stream so richly through our home that even as a child I was a part of that life. .

The home, then, should participate in the life of the world. My parents were fortunate. How can the average home participate in the life of the world? By making the problems of the world its problems, by trying to add something to the solution of those problems.

Children are not much interested in solved problems. They are enormously interested in unsolved ones.

And there is nothing academic in this. The problems of the world today are the problems of everybody. Take the one of the greatest problem in the world at this moment, the problem of race. I pause for a moment over that word *problem*. If anyone dislikes the word, if he avoids it, and tries to think of some other word, then it shows that very shrinking from life of which I have been talking. Problems are not tiresome, troublesome things—they are simply tangles waiting to be untied, questions waiting to be answered. A problem ought not to make an adult sigh—it ought to give him a feeling of eagerness, an excitement, a rise of interest, a challenge to wits and skill and wisdom, an invitation to put his mind and energies to a new and fascinating trial.

Well, in this spirit I use the word problem. There is, I say, for instance, that great human problem, race. I am not going to talk about it except to say that in my belief it is the greatest, and most Americans do not know it. Abroad the peoples know it. In the hearts of millions of colored peoples everywhere you would be astonished to realize, and yet we must realize, that they are asking themselves, "How can we live together with white people in the world, these white people who make wars, who hold us subject under cruel and unjust laws, who break their treaties with us, who hold the economic and military power of the world? Can white people be taught civilization and peace? Can they be brought to wish to live in harmony with colored peoples as equals in a free world, or will they continue to want to rule us when they have won the war, so that we must arm ourselves and fight them before we can gain our true freedom?" In our own country thirteen million

colored Americans are asking very much the same thing.

How many of us who are parents and teachers realize the great problem of race? How many of us are teaching our children to realize it with us, to try to think with us and feel with us to the right solution? If we are not, then we are doing our children the gravest injustice that parents and teachers can do to children—we are not preparing them for life. For in the lifetime of our children there will very probably—I believe, unavoidably—come the necessity to decide whether or not the white race is to rule as totalitarian rulers over the subject colored races, or whether or not we can live democratically together as peoples upon the same earth. Are we preparing children for the wise solution of this question? It is a world problem, but it is a national problem, too, for us who are Americans, and it is the problem in almost every community in the United States.

It is the duty of every parent and teacher to see that in his own community the children are made aware of the problem of race and to pass on, not prejudices, but freedom of choice to the new generation to deal with what in their time may be a choice which will result either in world harmony or the greatest and most horrible war the human race has yet seen.

Another of the great human problems is the proper relationship between men and women. It is not necessary or right for either to feel superior or inferior—so we have always taught and practiced in our own home. Yet to my amazement, now that my own children are beginning school, they bring home from outside the notion that girls are inferior to boys by nature, so that we are having to bolster up our heretofore perfectly unself-conscious little daughter with the conviction that

girls can do anything that boys can and that she is just as good and able as any boy ever was. At the same time we are trying to laugh out of our boys any notion of their congenital superiority to girls, a notion which I find they take to as easily as eating cake.

Now, I believe—at least I hope—that no school teacher is so medieval as to teach her pupils that boys are better than girls, and so I take it that some of my children's schoolmates are teaching them so because in their homes they see women in an inferior position, or they are somehow taught that men are intrinsically superior. Indeed, I see this thing instilled into children in many homes, and it is a pernicious and undemocratic doctrine and we shall never have a happy people or really happy homes until men cease believing in their superiority and women cease pretending to believe in their own inferiority. When parents allow their children to grow up with false notions of superiority and inferiority based on sex alone, they are adding to the confusion of the world. No sound basis of individual happiness and social sanity can be built upon an unequal relationship between men and women and history only confirms this. Do not forget that Nazism puts as twin doctrines the false ideas that one race is superior to another and that male is superior to female. Both of these notions are at the root of tyranny in society. I believe that parents should simply say to the child when he comes home with such ideas, "We do not believe in this. In our house boys and girls are the same. We know they are equally able, and we love them alike. Whatever advantages the boys have the girls have. And one is as responsible as the other." And never fail to act on this!

I have spoken of race and sex. Let me choose one more—the human problem of war, an age-old evil, and

yet one which I believe we are now beginning to understand. I see, very far off and faint, the glimmer of a day when war will be rejected as a rational means to any end.

I happen to have lived most of my years in China during a period when there were a number of small insignificant civil wars, very cruel and devastating to those who happened to be caught in them, but otherwise of no importance. Who made these wars? Why, war lords—that is, out of the people somewhere there would rise a little Hitler, rise first because he liked war, and second because some economic or other crisis in a locality lifted him to a place of momentary power. Or, like our own gangsters, he just began to maraud and rob and kill. There are such persons born out of what inheritance we do not yet know. What interested me was that they were all so much alike. The mentality of a militarist is as like that of another militarist, whatever his race or nation, as one Mongolian cretin is like another. The symptoms are the same.

There is a profound psychological shock in learning to kill. The first time it is done there is horror mingled with the excitement. Soon the horror is gone or it becomes the excitement. Finally, war becomes a pastime of extraordinary power over those who indulge in it. There has not been sufficient study made of the effect upon the human individual of being sanctioned to kill his fellow man, as war does sanction it. There is not only the violation of a deep physical instinct but of the long-built-up acquired sense that murder is wrong. War cuts across both, and the shock is more than the average man can bear.

War takes place in the world because there are individuals who love war as there are individuals who

love to get drunk, to lie, to rob, to murder. When there are in addition situations of class or individual injustice and social insecurity it is easy for these men to rise to power.

I am not a pacifist. I think war is inevitable so long as we do nothing to stop the conditions which over and over again produce war. The great problem of war today is how the people of a nation can control the machines of war so that they do not fall into the hands of warmakers and how we may settle the inequalities among peoples in peace and order.

It is absurd to talk of stopping war when war has begun. But it is possible to stop war at its beginning. It is possible to prevent its development. No war, appears out of the blue. There is no such thing as a true lightning war. Every major war is at least a generation in preparation, but we are so blindly used to thinking of war as inevitable, we are so ignorant of it when it is in preparation, we know so little about it psychologically that we let it come to crisis and then wonder why it has to be again. It will always be unless we prevent it by sane international and national planning and by checking the rise to power of the individuals who will make war.

Shall we shield our children from war? By no means. I think children, each child according to his age, ought to know what happens in war exactly as he would know about a disease in his vicinity and how to guard against it and what its dangers are. I think children ought to understand very early how war comes about. In a home if an unruly selfish child is not checked when he seizes the toys of the others he becomes unmanageable and intolerable. In a community a bully menaces the peace and possessions of all. The child understands very well the bully in school and street, and what is aggressive

war except bullying on a larger scale? The problem is the same, and it is important that the child should not be allowed to bully or be bullied, for in one case he is fitting himself for false leadership and in the other he is growing up subject to a false power.

There is in every child a natural desire to have a hero and to follow a leader if he is not a leader himself. But he should understand that it is basic in democratic life that he choose his leader for good reasons and for his own reasons and not because that leader has a big stick or a gun. And the natural leader among children should understand that he has not the right to practice leadership on anyone. We see by implication, therefore, that the truths about war are in microcosm in every community and home, and care taken here to make this clear to the child will do much to prevent war in the world.

But I cannot take up more of the specific aspects of life in their relation to the home. I return to my main point to say that I believe the problems of the world must first be met in the home, before we will have men and women sufficiently educated for the world, and that we do our children the most grave injustice when we do not fit them in the home for the world they will find waiting at their doors when they step outside. The child prepared in the home through all the life of the home for the life of the world beyond steps forward a self-confident and integrated creature. He will be afraid of nothing because he will say, "I know about this—I know what to do." If his home has shielded him and denied him the knowledge and practice of life he will be terrified. He will want to step back into his childhood, even back and back into the dark security of his mother's womb. But to such haven there is no return for one already born, no such thing as childhood for

those who are grown. And yet how many men and women spend their lives frustrated, discontented, afraid, because they have never been made ready to be anything but children.

Let the life of the world stream through our homes and through us all, men and women who have children and teach children.

EMOTIONAL STRAINS IN TIME OF CRISIS

by

James S. Plant, M.D.

WITH the millions of words that each day appear on this matter of "the crisis" what more can one say? And what is less predictable than the emotional reactions at such a time? Regardless of our best laid plans—they play us false in times of stress and crisis.

Rather let us put the matter in the opposite way. Instead of using what knowledge we feel that we now have for guessing how we will really face this crisis, let us, more honestly, look to the crisis to answer for itself certain questions. Some of you are acquainted with my belief that it is in times of stress that we realistically assay our social relationships.

It is my thesis today that the set of postulates which you and I have gone along building in rather comfortable fashion for a generation are now to be put to the test. In other words, I do not intend to speak on emotional strains in a time of crisis, but rather to tell you that the clinical data of the next few years will write that record, and that my best service is to prepare you for that document, to outline the questions that the crisis will force us to answer.

Each of us would like to know the answers to these six questions—indeed they cut so essentially to the foundations of all our work that we feel that we *must* know the answers. But I am equally certain that no

one of us today can answer any of them. I am further sure that if these particular questions are answered with any clarity over these next few years, the struggle and sacrifice involved will have been worth while.

The first question we address to ourselves. What have we learned about children that we can use in the present crisis? Over this generation we have built up a sizable theory as to parent-child relationships. We have countless books on the so-called problems of children. But somehow these don't seem to help at this particular moment. Each of us has met the worried parent who looks out on these next few years with all sorts of concern and we give wonderful words of theory—but has this any reality? Unless I am very much mistaken it will be the children themselves who will tell us.

One set of data from the last twenty years deserves recording. In terms of economic and social stress, there were two apparently very different periods through the twenties and thirties. Yet the problems of children brought to such an agency as the Juvenile Clinic seemed about the same in one period as in the other. That is, if I were to list the children and the problems referred to us for each of the eighteen years that we have been operating you would not be able to tell from the lists which years belong in the "good times" and which in the "bad times." There have been changes in the sources of referral and in the types of situations in which we have been asked to help—but these changes are parts of a trend running through the whole period and not, so far as I can determine, anything depending upon critical national situations.

There is one exception to this. This is that during the depression years we have had more demands for in-

stitutional placement of the obviously unfit. In our own experience even this change was forced by social agencies rather than by conditions within the family. Over these twenty years one definite development was a better understanding of those who are really misfits in the complicated world in which we live. That is, I am quite sure we can today measure better than we ever could those who deviate enough from the norm to make their adjustment difficult.

But that is not the problem which we face today. The question of how ordinary, usual children will face a crisis such as we today face has not been answered. There are a few scattered points that I think should be made:

(1) From everything else that we know about people I think it highly probable that the children will pretty much copy us adults. Such experiences as the families represented in our clinic have had with death and other disaster indicate that the event itself has little meaning to the child—but that *the contagion of the adult attitudes is extremely important.*

(2) The data from abroad seem to indicate that the problem of food and diet is of major importance. That decline in morale for which the term "war weariness" is as good as any seems to depend to a large extent upon inadequate supplies of Vitamin B₁.

(3) I suspect that the question of the number of children involved is of great importance—that the individual shows a remarkable ability to adjust himself to those things which everyone else is accepting.

(4) It is possible that these critical days will mean nothing to our children. They are a very immediate lot and show a surprising disregard of things that are out of sight. Social workers and psychiatrists are exasperated by the child's calm disregard of what we adults

know to be matters over which he should be terribly disturbed. Parents are disappointed and distressed to find that the children's interest in the ownership of the red wagon or the hour of the next dance overshadows so many important "worth-while" matters. Perhaps this very pettiness of children will save them many futile headaches.

We know perfectly well how deep run the emotions of man, how relatively recent and superficial is his intellectual equipment, how the emotions trick our every step. How much progress have we really made in these last forty years toward "understanding" the emotions? What we have considered objective and scientific has usually been merely a coating of every emotional experience with brilliant words. We have been developing techniques for managing every human relationship. We have volumes of proof that delinquency or marriage can be interpreted with the calculating machine.

Is it going to take the horror of war to bring us to our senses?

The crisis that concerns us now, the unexpected for which we are not prepared, is not merely another death or disaster, another "depression" of unemployment and insecurity. It is a crisis that reaches all of us with the licking and searing flames of hatred, cruelty, vindictiveness, intolerance. Here we cannot fall back upon the ceremonies appropriate for funerals, or upon techniques aimed at economic redirection.

For how can we now counsel our children to scrutinize in calm intellectuality what threatens them and all the rest of us? Or will we fight fire with fire?

Unpalatable as all this is to us, we must face the question or it will intrude itself upon us. To love, to hate, with clear eye to venture or with panicky anxiety

to fear—these will not be denied in their compelling sweeps. There is the question that lies before us and, unless I am very much mistaken, any of its three answers is full of trouble. And, unless I am very much mistaken, the next years, instead of we ourselves, will answer it.

(1) Are we to have our schools coolly analyze conflicting ideologies? In the heat of the present crisis are school and home to teach the child that we may possibly be wrong in what we stand for? Can we now set up clinics for counseling on international affairs?

(2) There is a second answer that frankly recognizes the power and sweep of the emotional surges. This is that we whip up the loyalty and devotion of children to our cause. Willy-nilly, right or wrong.

(3) The third answer is that we deliberately set aside reason and meet hate with hate, intolerance with intolerance. While we were still thousands of miles from physical danger we were well pumped full with *words* as to understanding, as to the need for controlling the emotions. Even today this answer is unacceptable to those of us who in family or nation know the tragic aftermath of all this—the silly round of having to build life all over again from the ashes of fear and hatred.

But we are talking about a *crisis*. The luxury of words must be suspended in an emergency. Today we need only remind ourselves that the problems, the ventures, the joys and tragedies of life are in what we feel—not in what we know. In an emergency we draw upon the forces most easily and most effectively mobilized. And of all the emotions the most easily mobilized and immediately effective are those of jealousy and hatred. These things you know as well as I—and do not like any better than I. Perhaps out of it all we

will come to realize in this country that the flame of loyalty must be kept constantly burning. Perhaps this is the only way that we can keep from having periodically to turn to the whiplash of hatred.

I realize that these are words concerning the very basis of our hopes for our children. We have said so much about the training in hatred in the totalitarian countries that we have no place for the development of the same thing in this country. But is this perhaps not a present necessity? If we choose to close our eyes to the unpleasant—we will stumble and fall.

The third question carries us again back to our faith in the theory which we have been developing. This has been the age that discovered the child—a somewhat dramatic and immediate way of saying that we have discovered the individual. Some of the resulting movements—at the moment one thinks of Progressive Education—have swung far in their appeal that we bend all of our institutional structure to the development of the individual. I need not recall the hundreds of times that you have heard about the cramping and thwarting effects of regimentation.

And now as a crisis appears what are we to do? Is all of this to be given up? Will the next few years perchance teach us that individualization is a sort of expensive luxury toward which man will strive but which must be forgotten in moments of present peril? Perhaps many generations which struggle for that far-off goal will have to turn aside—at any rate, for a time—to focus the eyes on some nearer goal. Perhaps this highly individualized development is one that we can scarce now afford and one that must await a much better stabilized world many generations ahead.

There is another possibility—that in our appraisal

of values up to the present time we have not assigned to "regimentation" the importance which it deserves. It was very well said a long time ago that one finds himself by losing himself; and there is more than a bare possibility that this is still true. Perhaps out of the present crisis will come a deeper appreciation of the meaning and value of loyalties. It is not that we crush the individual but that we enrich him. This does not deny that regimentation can distort the personality—nor does it lose its eyes to the strength and feeling of growth that comes to the individual as he identifies himself with something that is greater than he.

And these coming years will ask another question of you and me—perhaps they will answer it. It cannot be answered today. To show what is involved here we will have to go back a bit. All of us have more or less one common interest. We use various terms, but in the main we are students of human relationships. Moreover, we span in our own lifework pretty much all of a surging new attack on these problems. People, since they began to live together, have probably been interested in this problem; but certainly only within our own lifetime has there been this broad and systematic effort at a scientific approach to it all. And how we have groped! Take the best case histories at five-year intervals over these last forty years! Or let your mind wander back to the pet phrases and approaches of a few years ago. How unreal these ghosts seem now! Are there common threads? I am sure that there are and that perhaps these years of crisis will force us to see them.

At the surface level of our behavior we seem to be very different. At the level of the mechanisms which compel that behavior, you and I are still different but not so different. At the level of our attitudes we are

even more alike. As layer after layer of our learnings and conditionings and cultural acquisitions is removed we find ourselves more and more similar. Finally, at the level of basic needs, race and sex and geographical differences all seem to have quite disappeared. The same sort of discovery I'm sure lies ahead of us in what might be called the area of social interpretation. We must see certain fundamentals beneath the fetishes of one or another sort of diagnostic or therapeutic approach. We haven't seen that yet. Each five years has made some new discovery that quite threw into the discord all we knew before. Every new discovery, every new formula was accepted as altogether true—only to be later rejected as altogether false. Will this present period of crisis open our eyes to some new brilliant facet of this exciting stone? Or will we in sheer desperation at its very difference be driven to finding those more basic laws that underlie the angles of all the facets?

We have been an opportunistic lot. Each new social problem and era has meant that with a shout of joy we have suddenly seen a new segment of the entire field—perhaps the new problems of these coming years will seem just another lovely new era to explore so that once more we can declare that the wonders of other years have been surpassed. But I can only hope that the very newness and complexity that this means will drive us to getting out our surveying instruments—to get at more basic relationships and notions that run through, I am sure, all of these varied approaches and eras.

Is there much use in all of this that we have been doing in the exploration of human motives and behavior?

"Oh, yes," we say; but does the rest of the world say that? A knowledge of what lies back of our problems—this never-ending search for what makes Johnny tick—this all seems worth-while to us and we haven't been slow in informing our purblind contemporaries of that fact. Johnny, too, is interested and comes full tilt to get the answer—if he has the time. But if he hasn't the time (or the money) he has a naïve way of going on ticking without perhaps knowing why.

What bothers me is that you and I represent a set of interests that seem to us to be of the deepest social and individual significance—but that in times of crisis when our work *ought* to be of the greatest importance we receive the scantiest recognition from those who need us the most. This is not meant to be a left-handed way of saying that we represent a useless sort of toy. Rather is it meant to raise seriously in our minds the question as to whether we are socially as useful as we think we are. Here we sit gravely peering into a crisis which may very well soon ask us to shoulder a musket or turn to a factory! Perhaps it will be good for us in these coming months to watch as to where the world's eyes turn. An harassed people turns where it feels that it can get help. Will it turn to us?

Mob rule and mob judgment make many a terrible mistake. I'm not talking about a judgment on our interests and work that rests solely with the pressing need of a sorely tried people. But neither is there a place for the kind of therapeutic approach that disdains what the patient thinks he wants. If all that you and I are doing is socially worth while, if you and I are to accept any sort of social responsibility, then our work must be in terms of what our patients are ready to accept. I think that I am right in saying that the work which we represent has been liberally supported as long as

there was plenty of money—and that it has been among the first things curtailed as money became scarcer. There is something wrong about that. Of course it's *always* this way: it's the *patient* who is unco-operative.

And there is one more question that the crisis brings. I've saved this to the last because it seems to me the most important. Do we know for what it is that we struggle? This question would seem to you to have little to do with children and, besides, I can hear the ready answer, "Oh we struggle to preserve Democracy." Words are so easy. Any real statement as to our final goals would be different from each of us—just as each of us is dismayed if we get the answers to our questions, "But what do you *mean* by Democracy?" If I give an answer, it is not to impose it upon you—though I suspect that what I have to say will not do too much violence to the views of any person here.

I take it that since that dim first time when there were two people, there were two different assumptions as to the means of progress. One saw growth in opportunity, in one or another manipulation of the environment. The other saw growth in what occurs within the individual. Down through the ages this struggle has gone on—scarce a century of recorded history when the difference has not flared into bitter flame. You know it by many different names in the arena of politics, of finance, of religion, of education. Today the two philosophies battle once more. The one pins its faith to plans, programs, curricula, planned economy of one sort or another. The other pins its faith to the slow toilsome struggle upward of each individual.

I take it that Democracy is that form of governance which is an expression not only of respect for the in-

dividual, but of faith in the individual. Seen in this light, the struggle to preserve Democracy is not being fought only on the blood-stained battlefields of the world. It's easy to escape into that assumption—to escape from what seems to me the fact that the struggle is yours and mine, in our neighborhood and in our homes. For once more the question is raised, Where is the kingdom of God? Do we depend upon numbers, programs, curricula, pieces of social machinery, planned economy, or does progress come only with the spiritual strength and growth of each person?

The Chinese poet Wang-Wei was asked four thousand years ago, what is the most worth-while thing in life? He replied:

I am old,
 Nothing interests me now.
 Moreover, I am not very intelligent
 And my ideas
 Have never traveled further than my feet.
 I know only my forest
 To which I always come back.
 You ask me
 What is the supreme happiness here below?
 It is listening to the song of a little girl
 As she goes on down the road,
 After having asked me the way.

What is your answer and mine to the needs of children in a time of crisis? It doesn't belittle all of the efforts of all of the people toward guns and armies and plans for adequate defense to say that the *real* struggle is within each of us—do we have our faith in

these, or in "the song of the little girl as she goes on down the road"?

If I am unable to tell you what emotional strains there will be for our children in a time of crisis (or how they will react to these) it is only because I'm sure that no one can tell you—except the children themselves. And unless I am very much mistaken, the information which they will give us over these next months is going to answer some very important questions about us as parents, as teachers, as workers in the children's field.

I repeat these questions because if they are answered, the sorrow and tragedy of these years will have been of real avail in the progress not only of our own particular field of work, but of our whole civilization. They are these:—

1. Have we as yet anything to contribute to the problem of usual, normal, everyday people in the face of a real crisis?

2. Can our plea for an *understanding* approach to the emotional surges of man stand up in the face of mass emotional appeal? Can we reason as to hatred or are we still at the place where it must be met by faith, blind loyalty, or by hatred itself?

3. Can an overweening interest in the development of the individual continue to disregard the individual's need to be "regimented," to be lost, to identify himself with the group?

4. Can we find common threads through the varying experiences of man? Will our work with children be one thing in the twenties, one other in the thirties, and still another in the forties—or do the basic problems of man simply appear in some new guise with each decade? Are problems ever solved—or are they merely restated?

5. Have we, in our work with children, anything real to offer, or will people in times of real travail turn elsewhere?

6. And finally, for what do we have our conferences, our various agencies, our plans and work and hopes? Is it that we shall build ever more perfect bits of social machinery, is it that new and vast projects for the mass production of social betterment may be made and admired? Or is it perchance really true that "the supreme happiness here below is listening to the song of a little girl as she goes on down the road, after having asked us the way"?

CHILDREN OF GREAT BRITAIN IN WARTIME

by

Susan Isaacs

THE great disruption of family life in Britain from the enforced migration of large numbers of children to safe areas has thrown family relationships into high relief. Psychologists and social workers have had the chance to observe on a large scale what the loss of family life means both to parents and to children. Some investigators have been able to make wide surveys of the general responses of children to these unusual conditions. Others have been concerned in clinical work with the individual needs of those children who have found especially difficult the strain of adapting themselves to life in the homes of strangers. Much has been learned of what war conditions in general and evacuation in particular have meant to children of different ages.*

By far the majority of the 750,000 school children sent away from their own homes in September 1939, as well as of the larger number evacuated the following autumn and winter, were billeted in private households. It is the conditions under which children succeeded or failed in adapting themselves to other people's homes which we have thus been able mainly to observe. I do not intend to speak here of children placed in camps or hostels.

* See *Children in War Time*.

In Cambridge, an intensive survey of the success and failure in billeting evacuated children in private homes was carried out in the autumn of 1939 and the spring of 1940.*

This survey included several studies:

(a) A general account of the local organization of Cambridge as a reception area. (Three thousand school children from various London boroughs were received and accommodated in Cambridge.)

(b) An assessment of success and failure in the relationships of nearly 700 children (from two London boroughs) with their Cambridge foster parents, and of the general conditions of success and failure.

(c) A study of the children's own comments upon their life in their new surroundings.

(d) A detailed firsthand psychological study of 86 children, 40 successes and 46 failures.

(e) An account of the work of a child guidance clinic operating in the area.

(f) A survey of the facilities for children's recreation in Cambridge.

(g) A study of the homes and families of a proportion of those children who had returned to their own homes in London by a given date. (About one quarter of the children from one of the London boroughs studied and about one half of those from the other had then returned to their own homes.)

(h) A study of the views and impressions of the London teachers acting in the Cambridge schools.

The task of placing evacuated children in the foster homes of Cambridge and their supervision afterwards was carried out with a greater degree of care and understanding than in many reception areas. It was therefore not surprising to find that a high proportion

* See *The Cambridge Evacuation Survey*.

of children were contented—91.8 per cent of those studied. Yet many difficulties and breakdowns occurred here, too, and their causes were similar to those operating in other parts of the country. The general conclusions drawn from the Cambridge survey are on the whole in harmony with the impressions of psychologists and social workers in other areas.

The views and conclusions which follow are based partly upon the results of the Cambridge survey, and partly upon my own clinical studies and psychoanalytic experience of children. They are my personal views, although I believe that my collaborators would in the main agree with them.

It is beyond question that the country air, the wider horizons, the new and varied experiences of life in a rural district or small town, have brought greater health and pleasure to the children dispersed from the cities and industrial centers. Yet it is equally true that these benefits have been fully realized only when by accident or design the children have been happily placed and settled in their foster homes. For children, people are even more important than places. Many foster parents have had a natural and intuitive understanding of what the little strangers must be feeling and wanting. But a more conscious and deliberate understanding of the child's point of view is required for those who are responsible for planning and supervising the work of evacuation and for selecting, advising and encouraging foster parents.

What is needed, is, first, an appreciation of what it means to children generally to be suddenly uprooted under the threat of bombing, and taken away from their parents to entirely new surroundings. Secondly, an understanding of the particular needs of individual

children, in relation to available foster homes. (I am leaving on one side the no less urgent need to understand the human nature of the parents and foster parents.)

First and foremost is the effect of the actual sudden parting from parents and family.

In the Cambridge survey, the children were asked to write freely about "What I like in Cambridge" and "What I miss in Cambridge." Their essays show how deeply they miss their own fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters and home atmosphere, even when they are happily placed and otherwise contented in their foster homes. "I only miss Mum and Dad and my sister and relations most and few friends that have stayed behind. Also just my house." (boy of 14) "The things I miss most in Cambridge is my Father and Mother and family." (boy aged 13) "I miss my home in Tottenham and I would rather be there than where I am . . . I miss my sister and my friends." (girl aged 13) "I miss my father most of all as there is no man in the billet where I am living" (girl aged 13) "I miss my brother always teasing me." (girl aged 13) "I miss my two little brothers who make a lot of noise." (girl aged 11) "I miss dolls Pram and Mummy and Daddy and Granma and bathing her at night and putting her to bed and put cums down her throat and bits of fish and dressing her in the morning and put her plats in and cloming her hair and nursing her." (girl aged 7)

The fundamental relationships of life have suddenly been cut across—for an indefinite period, as the children realize; and moreover, under disturbing conditions. This is very different from going away for a fortnight's summer holiday with a return to an un-

changed home. It is different indeed from leaving home to enter a residential school. Both such situations are a normal part of life and well prepared for. In both, the child goes away knowing that it is only for a limited time and that his home and parents remain unaffected. In spite of this knowledge, he may yet secretly fear that he may never see his parents again; but he has no real grounds for such a fear, and everything in his surroundings goes to show him that such an anxiety is only a feeling, with no basis in fact. In the experience of evacuation, however, many things help to support and confirm the child's dread that his parents may be lost forever, and that, before he can see them again or return to his home, all may have been ruined.

Quite a number of the younger children and of the adolescents have shown open anxiety on behalf of their parents, the fear that their homes and their father and mother might at any time be injured and destroyed by enemy bombs. Incidentally, I would like to say that I believe that this anxiety on behalf of their parents, among British children in the United States, has sometimes been overlooked or underestimated by their generous hosts and hostesses.

This fear was acute in the minds of many children immediately after dispersal from their homes—whether at the onset of war or during the second period of evacuation when destructive raids had been actually experienced. It had a great deal to do with many of the difficulties (such as bed-wetting, defiance and stealing) which some of them showed during the first weeks and months away from home. In some children this anxiety on behalf of their parents was largely unconscious and only made its presence felt in such symptoms; in others it was expressed openly and clearly.

The loss of the parents and family circle is felt by

the child in all the intimate details of daily life, even when the home was in fact far from ideal. Father is not there to teach him what is right and reprove him if he does wrong. A boy of fourteen wrote, "I miss getting hidings from my dad when I get into trouble." Mother is not there to feed him, to tuck him up in bed and kiss him good night, to get him up and ready for school next morning. The familiar cozy warmth of family life is missed very much. One child drew the picture of father and mother, brothers and sister, roasting chestnuts by the fireside on a Saturday evening—"and it does not matter how much mess you make so long as you brush it all up afterwards." Another girl of thirteen says, "Although it feels nice not to be teased I'm afraid I miss it."

Gone, too, is the pleasure of taking the baby (or the baby next door) for a walk or a game. Gone are the opportunities for helping mother, running errands, washing up, the general sharing of duties and pleasure, being taken to the pictures, and walks and jaunts at the week ends. Many children speak sadly of the way they miss their pets, the dogs and cats and canaries. "My mother says that every time the door opens at home my pussy thinks it is me coming back, and it makes me very sad." And the cousins who come to play on Saturday afternoon, the loved and battered toys, the garden, the well-known streets and houses (one child of eight says, "I miss the barage of beloons as well"), all the give and take of family life, with its ups and downs, its quarrels and its forgivenesses, its warmth and familiar smells, its sense of belonging, its background and its roots—all these are lost at one blow. It is not merely one aspect, but the whole of life which is suddenly new. Each child feels that he has left a large part of himself behind there in the great city, and does not know

whether he will ever recover it again. His home may be poor and mean, he may be in fact ill taught and ill trained. Yet to him, home is still home; it is still the focus and center of his life—and that has suddenly gone.

This feeling is strong in all children, although some show it more plainly than others. The age of the child has some influence on the extent to which he can tolerate the conflict of feelings aroused by his loss. The younger and the older children (under seven and over twelve) are more openly affected, more deeply disturbed in their feelings, behavior and bodily control. In the Cambridge survey, the difficulties of billeting showed a sharp rise at or after thirteen years. Not enough children under seven were included in this survey to make the results significant, but general experience confirms that other things being equal, it is children in the middle years who settle down most readily in their foster homes. In the middle years, children are on the whole more successful both in hiding their feelings and in actually adapting to new conditions against which there is no appeal. At these ages they have so much love of adventure and change, and they find special satisfactions in the sort of activities which country life can provide for them. Nevertheless most children between seven and twelve have also shown how much they miss their parents and home life.

Quite a number of children dealt with their fear of war and the loss of home in a different way. So far from feeling open dread lest their homes should now be in ruins and their parents dead, they clung at first to the belief that the war and the blackout were only real in the place where they now lived, the village or country town. Only here is it dark and gloomy and quiet, only here is there oppressive blackout and danger.

Such children seem to have kept in their minds a picture of their homes as they knew them before the war, cozy and content, brightly lit, full of life and happiness. They wanted to get back home because they have kept this picture of everything that was good there and clung to it as if it alone were real.

The loss of parents and home and familiar surroundings is, however, only one half of the child's problem. The other half is the positive claim of the new and unfamiliar world, and the need to accept it and adapt to it. The strange town and unfamiliar streets stir up in many children the fear of getting lost. Again, to wake up at night with every detail of the house and bedroom strange is intimidating for many even of the older children. In the moment of waking, instead of the familiar outlines and contacts, everything is new and potentially hostile. A four-year-old once remarked to another child about some visitors: "These people don't like you, 'cos they've never seen you before." Habits and habitual expectations are no guide. The effort of learning, or the fear of getting hurt if one attempts to move about a strange house in the dark, is very acute in some children. And this is not only an external problem of light and dark and space and shape and direction. The familiar rooms, the familiar furniture, the lines and shapes and distribution of light and shade which one has known from early childhood and shared with parents and brothers and sisters, mean love and warmth and comfort too. The new house means new and unknown people, new and unknown demands. It takes time to learn that the new home, the new people, are friendly and trustworthy.

All the daytime habits of the new home are strange too. Things one was allowed to do as a matter of course may be frowned upon here. Things one does not

know how to do may be required. Ways of eating, ways of dressing, ways of arranging things on the meal table, all the countless small details of habit in the daily life may be changed, may have to be relearned before there is any sense of ease and familiarity in the new surroundings.

This is especially true of those children who have been placed with families of a markedly different social and economic standard. On the whole it seems true that billeting has been most successful when there was no great difference in social life and status between the foster child and the foster parents. Take, for example, the question of clothes. It may seem a desirable thing on grounds of bodily hygiene to change completely the clothing of a poor child from the slums and discard all his own poor outfit, when he enters the home of wealthier people. But it must be remembered that the child's garments, no matter how poor and mean, constitute a link with home and parents, and to deprive him of them completely at one blow is to add greatly to the strangeness of his new world and to widen the gulf which already yawns so deeply between him and his own people. Some children have been so depressed by the loss of the clothes which mother has put upon them, and the criticism of mother implied in the rejection of their clothes, that the ultimate effect on their general well-being was far from advantageous.

Even the question of change of food has this aspect. Many people were surprised to find that poor children from the cities did not always take readily to the different and perhaps better food in their new homes. They missed their "fish and chips." They often preferred their familiar "bread and marge" to good and varied fresh country food. But again this is not simply a matter of habit or of a perverted taste; nor is it

merely a rejection of what is new and strange. "Bread and marge" have been a part of home. The food which mother gives is good partly *because* mother gives it. It is bound up with her care and her affection; no matter how meager her resources or how unskilled her care may be from our point of view, to the child it is mother's care. He cannot suddenly turn away from all that mother and father have done for him and transfer his feelings of love to new food, the new clothes, new ways of life, new people.

It is so with the new ways of speech, the different accent and idiom, which the child may meet in his new world. We know what coldness, enmity and loneliness, differences of speech, clothing, manners and food may bring about between educated adults. These things have a still more personal meaning for the young child, since he is so much more dependent upon his surroundings and needs so much more the warm intimacy of home and the familiar idiom of daily life. He has struggled to learn a particular set of manners, a particular way of speech in order to please mother and father; and if now he finds that his ways of eating and talking do not please his foster mother, he cannot change himself all at once, since he has not yet learned to love and trust her. He cannot yet unlearn what mother has taught him, since the ways which have pleased her seem to bring her near in his mind. A foster home which may be more spacious and cleanly than his own may thus seem to the child a bare and empty place, forbidding in its very cleanliness, until he has learned to love the people who live in it.

The parting from his parents and adapting to life in a home, new in every way, stirs up again in the child, no matter what his age, those intense conflicts

of feeling which he passed through in his earliest days of childhood.

Even though the children may have been told that their being sent away from home is a government plan for their safety, a wise and good thing, another reason takes precedence in their minds. Even though they see so many other children leaving home at the same time, yet they cannot rid themselves fully of the idea that children are sent away from home because they are or have been bad.

Every young child has not only feelings of love and dependence toward his parents, but also impulses of greed, jealousy and defiance. Hence he feels a secret guilt and dread of losing his loved parents, as a result of his own hate and greed and anger. Being away from his home and parents as a result of the war, along with his fears on their behalf, revive these early anxieties and unconscious conflicts. He fears that he may really have lost his loved ones forever. And he fears the separation so acutely partly because it seems like a punishment for his own early angers and defiances, his own jealousy of brothers and sisters, his own greed and lack of love toward them.

Every child has to cope with these feelings and impulses. They are normal in development, no matter how troublesome. In the dear and familiar life of the family, the child is able to some extent to overcome his early angers and hatreds and anxieties—at any rate the worst of them—by the continued comfort of his parents' presence and care and affection, as well as by what he learns to do for them in return. But now, suddenly deprived of this give and take, his secret dread of having injured his parents and brothers and sisters by his defiant anger and hidden greed and destructiveness, surges back upon him, and he fears he will lose them

forever. Now he can no longer serve and help them and he sees no way to make amends for his naughtiness.

These were the feelings and conflicts of feeling from which sprang so many of the difficulties (bad language, defiance and self-assertiveness, open anxiety and night terrors, bed-wetting, etc.) which showed themselves at first in many evacuated children, and still burden a proportion of them. The majority of these children—of those who have been left in their foster homes—have, however, been able to get over the parting from their parents and have learned to be at ease and even to love their new homes and new surroundings.

Yet that things are not too simple even in the feelings of the more adaptable children is shown by the frequent reports that some of them have been upset by the visits of their parents. Some children felt acutely the repeated parting, and after the visit became again anxious, quarrelsome or dirty for a time. This led some people to argue that the visits of the children's own parents were a bad thing, disturbing their relationship with the foster home. Careful observations over a longer period, however, have shown that this is not so in the majority of cases. With some families it would always be true. But the Cambridge evidence showed that at the very least, parents' visits could not be regarded as unfavorable to foster home relationships; and it is the general view of the social workers that, in the long run and in the greatest number of cases, such regular visits are a favorable influence.

These children who seem to be more unhappy after the visits of their parents help us to understand another important aspect of the life of the parted child—the acute conflict he suffers between his love and longing for his own home and his own parents, and his pleasure and interest in his new home. This conflict of loyalties

is very much to be reckoned with, in all children. Very few children can easily or immediately transfer their love and loyalty, their respect and dependence, to strangers and a new home without some sense of guilt and distress on behalf of their own parents. Nor is it desirable that they should be able to do so easily and immediately. If they could appear at once to forget their loyalty and love for their own homes, this could hardly make for stable social development in later life.

This conflict of loyalties enters into all the details of their new life, such as the difficulties of accepting new ways of eating, new food, different clothes, different ways of speech, new idioms of living. No matter how good and attractive the new ways may appear to be, and often are in the many excellent homes which have received these little strangers, yet for the child fully to accept them and enjoy them means *to him* turning his back upon father and mother and all that he has been taught to hold good and dear up to that point.

To some degree all children can and should forget the home picture, since although love and loyalty to one's parents are essential elements in a stable character, yet it is also normal to be able to transfer some of one's affection and respect to other people, to widen the circle of one's love and honored ones from the home to the school and to other friends, to heroes and heroines in all walks of life. In normal conditions, however, this does not mean turning one's back completely upon one's home and choosing these others instead of one's parents. It means loving them also, not taking the one instead of the others. Under evacuation, however, it may seem to the child that life now demands that he should turn away altogether from his own parents and love the new ones instead. Where differences in modes and standards of life are marked, this is bound to seem

to him a rejection of his own, and therefore to make him feel guilty and disloyal toward them.

It is for these reasons that billeting has proved most successful where (among other factors) one or both of two conditions have been met; first, where there has been comparatively little difference in mode of life and social standards, so that to accept the new way of life did not necessarily mean condemnation of the old; and secondly, where the foster home and the children's own home were able to maintain a friendly and sympathetic relation. As I have said, the regular visits of parents is one help in this regard.

Another help in this respect is the placing of brothers and sisters in the same foster home. The Cambridge data showed clearly that the presence of the child's own brothers and sisters in the foster home definitely favored adjustment to the new home. The incidence of difficulty was 5 per cent with those children who were billeted with siblings, as against 10 per cent in the case of children billeted without any other member of their own family. The presence of other children (foster family children or other evacuéés, not siblings) had no appreciable effect upon success or failure. This suggests that it is not the presence of other children that matters, but the continuance of part of the child's own family life.

Any influence which lessened the shock of parting and the degree of strangeness, helping to keep alive close links with the home environment, had a favorable effect upon the ease with which the child adapted himself to the new home and new world.

The teachers were often able to play an important part in maintaining these links. Those children who remained with their own school units, their own teachers and schoolmates, found it much easier to settle down

than those who lost teachers and school companions, as well as the home circle. Especially were they helped when the teachers worked in close touch with the foster homes and co-operated actively with the supervisors of billeting. Many teachers, both men and women, report how unmistakably children of all ages put them in the place of their parents, and turned to them in the most intimate way for help and guidance.

These, then, are some of the major aspects of the meaning of the experience of evacuation to children generally, and of the conditions which aid the children to accept this experience with equanimity.

They may be summed up by saying that evacuated children need, first, warmth of atmosphere, love and friendliness, no less than good food, shelter and clothing. They need a *home*. And secondly, they need help in keeping alive the images of their own parents and their loyalties to their own homes. The boon of good food, country air, new experiences are of little worth if they drive a wedge between the child and his own family.

Whilst the great majority of evacuated children (i.e., of those who were not taken home by their parents, for various reasons) found enough external help and sufficient resources in themselves to enable them to adapt themselves with a reasonable measure of success to the new conditions of life, the strain proved too much for a certain number, as was to be expected. -

Many studies have been made in various parts of Britain of those children who presented special problems to their foster homes and billeting authorities, and a growing number of clinics, hostels and social workers have been engaged in helping the ill adjusted. In the Cambridge survey, a detailed study was made, by means of intelligence tests and psychiatric inter-

views, of 46 children who failed in their foster home relationships, and of a control group of 40 who were successful. Of the 656 children studied, 8.2 per cent were more or less unhappily adjusted.

The intelligence of the child does not appear to have much importance for success in billeting, as one might expect, but his personality is a weighty factor. Even among normal children, whilst certain temperaments and types of character are easy to fit in anywhere, others are less ready to adapt themselves to strange people and apt to give rise to friction. But certain sorts of neurotic disturbance make very special demands upon any foster home.

Of the 46 children rated as unsatisfactory in foster home relationships, only 7 were assessed as quite normal in their emotional responses, whilst 10 gave evidence of only slight emotional difficulties, not serious enough to cause concern for their future development. The remaining 29 were children suffering from emotional disturbances serious enough to call for treatment, 9 being definitely severe cases.

Of the control group of 40 children who had satisfactory relationships with their foster parents, 24 were diagnosed as perfectly normal, whilst 9 showed slight emotional handicaps. There were 7 who were in a serious state of emotional disturbance, one being regarded as a severe case.

It thus appears that whilst the more normal children are likely to settle readily in any reasonably considerate foster home, yet the more disturbed children also and even those suffering from serious psychological trouble, may yet become contented if their needs are understood and an appropriate foster home is chosen. On the whole it appeared true that depressed or anxious children prospered best in quiet, rather conventional homes,

where they were by themselves and free to follow their own devices, whereas the more aggressive boys and girls did better in homes with a more lively atmosphere, where there were others of the same age and where the children could be kept actively interested and employed. Those children who suffered from serious psychological difficulties, urgently calling for treatment, and yet had adapted well to their foster homes, were all of them either of an inhibited anxious type or of a solitary and withdrawn type. No child of this latter type was found among those rated as unsatisfactory in the foster home.

The evidence suggested that whilst the quiet, withdrawn child, whether he is ill or well, may become a welcome guest in most foster homes, it is the child who shows active, outgoing aggressive qualities to a marked degree who will tend to become or remain an acute problem for the foster mother and supervisors of billeting.

Space will not allow me to fill out these broad generalizations with the examples which would give them life. As time went on after the first days of evacuation, experience showed more and more clearly that trained and skilled social workers who could understand the psychological needs of individual children were indispensable to the maintenance and smooth working of the whole scheme. Where such skilled help has become available, whether for helping and advising the foster mothers to deal with the more troublesome children as soon as difficulties arose, for allaying the anxieties of the children's own parents, or for transferring the children to other foster homes where their needs would be more satisfactorily met, serious friction and distress have usually been avoided or overcome.

To American minds, it may seem strange indeed that

in the year of grace 1939 such a lesson as to the need for the help of trained and skilled social workers in carrying out a vast and complex social experiment had yet to be learned in Great Britain. It has been a sharp lesson, and seems on the whole to have been growingly appreciated.

A word should be said as to the children who returned home. Of the total number of unaccompanied school children evacuated in September 1939, 43 per cent had returned home by January 1940, and the returns went on slowly at a diminishing rate, until destructive raids began in the late summer.

These returns were by no means all attributable to failure in adaptation on the part of the children. In the Cambridge survey, a study was made of the families of 150 children who had been taken home, and it revealed many complex motives at work in the minds of the parents. The dominant motives seemed to fall into three groups:

(a) Those relating to family feeling, the anxiety and loneliness of the parents, the homesickness or worry of the children. This accounted for about one third of the cases examined.

(b) Complaints about the foster homes and foster parents. In some cases at least these appeared to be justifications for bringing the children home rather than the real grounds for this action, which actually sprang from the parents' own longing to have the children back in the home.

(c) The third reason was the financial burden of keeping part of the family away from home, a burden which in many cases the billeting allowance by no means fully eased.

The experience of evacuation in Great Britain has

brought out in high relief the depth and strength of family feeling in ordinary people, on the one hand; and on the other, the urgent need for skilled understanding of the individual child and of the child's point of view in general, if great social experiments affecting the child are to be undertaken.

THE WORK OF WOMEN IN ENGLAND

by

Martha M. Eliot, M.D.

IF EVER in the history of our nation it has been wise to stop and consider what is happening to children and to take stock of the progress made in providing an environment in which they can grow and develop into vigorous, well-poised, co-operative members of a democratic society, that time is today. If ever there has been a need for action to put into effect each of the procedures that are known to be essential to the health and well-being and social adjustment of each individual child, that time is today.

For today this country is at war. And though, once embarked in a war, all effort must be concentrated on winning it so that the democratic way of life may be continued, there would be little use in doing so if we were to emerge from it with children and young people stunted in growth and development and unstable in their reactions to life. Today we must make certain that we know what we are fighting for, and that our children know. We must waste no time in creating even greater opportunity than they have had heretofore for growth and health and poise and understanding that in turn will create the desire and the will to co-operate with each other in making democracy work.

To find the way to do all this, it is not necessary to go beyond the borders of our own land for the knowl-

edge of what to do or for examples of effective action and progress. But the program of action for children in the United States is spotty and incomplete. Today we have no such close-meshed network of maternity care and child health service as had Great Britain at the beginning of the present war. Only in recent years have we begun to spread across the country even a coarse network of basic health and social services for children; and today the holes and gaps in the net are only too apparent. There is much that can be learned from the recent wartime experiences in Great Britain and from her foresight in providing for the health of her children in peacetime.

Today Great Britain has not only a widespread program of maternal and child health service, but as a result of her intensive war effort carefully conceived plans for the housing and protection and general welfare of workers and for the care of their children have been put into effective operation. Great Britain has learned that if men and women are to give their best at work they must be sure that their children are safe and well cared for.

The rapid growth of the defense program in the months preceding our entry into the war was accompanied by great movements of people to places wholly unequipped to meet even their own usual needs and has brought into strong light the fundamental defects in our provisions for the health and well-being of children.

But this migration of workers is not a movement of men wage earners only. Families are there—babies, little children, school children, adolescent youth, pregnant and nursing mothers—all crowding into tenements, living in trailers, in shacks, in improvised dwellings of

all kinds. Many children are without school. Many mothers and children are without medical care or health supervision. It is not always a question whether these people can pay or not. Often the facilities for health supervision and medical care of the children and maternity care for the mothers just do not exist. There may be too few doctors, or even none, in the mushroom communities. Frequently there is no hospital for many miles.

The migrations, the congestions, and the emergency needs create for the children new problems and new dangers. Often there is no child welfare worker to advise parents on the multitude of social situations that affect the lives of children and result in social maladjustment and conflict with the law. With the increased demand for labor in the war industries, women are being drawn into jobs, even women with young children who must be cared for in their mother's absence. Children too are being drawn into labor, and in many cases young children are subjected to exploitation by commercial interests in the street trades.

It would perhaps have been too much to expect that we should have had on hand at the beginning of a period of national crisis a reserve corps of workers to be moved into areas of need as soon as need arises. But certainly we should have reached the position where each and every community had at least the organization and the child health and welfare workers that we recognize as fundamental and that would have been the nucleus of an expanding program to meet the emergency needs. The great inadequacy or even utter lack of health and medical, social and recreational services for children and young people in many of our boom towns and industrial cities is more characteristic of an early pioneering society than of a settled and pros-

perous nation. The past decade offered us ample opportunities to learn how to meet the needs of great migrating groups of people, for thousands of families were on the march. These families had been uprooted and set adrift not alone by the economic disturbances, but by the natural forces themselves, as the blowing away of farm soil, or crop failures. We would have seized that opportunity if the welfare of the family were really our fundamental concern. Had we seized it we would now know better how to meet more effectively the present needs of the migrant armies of civilian war workers.

So far, in this national crisis, national resources have not been tapped to spread more widely or more effectively the basic program, or to meet the additional needs of the nation's mothers and children. Must we wait until this war is over to discover that the conservation of child life is important to our national life? Must we wait until the war situation is more serious before we patch up the known gaps in our national program for mothers and children, and make ready at least a mobile corps of trained professional and volunteer workers to meet more acute emergencies as they arise?

These questions are not meant to be rhetorical, but to put squarely before us the situation with which we are faced and to ask that we consider what should be done. We cannot expect every man in the fighting services and every worker in the supporting activities to keep in mind the nation's children. But unless these children are protected physically and spiritually, the outcome of any victory which we may achieve would be empty. For it is these millions of children who are to constitute but a few years hence the nation we are

striving to preserve, the nation we are presumably fighting for.

But let us turn to the experience of Great Britain and see what we may learn that would be helpful in our present situation. Steps to protect children in time of war in Great Britain were taken by the government and by others charged with their protection in time of peace in three periods: the long period of peacetime action since the previous war (1918-38); the period from just before the Munich crisis in 1938 to the declaration of war in September 1939; and the later period of action under the impact of war.

The basic provisions for child health and maternity care developed throughout Great Britain during the past two decades and those for school medical service that have been in effect still longer are, without doubt, determining factors in the success of the emergency measures adopted for the protection of children during the present war. From sad experience at the outbreak of war, the government authorities learned that full quotas of medical and nursing personnel must be kept available for the maternity and child health and school medical service in the bombed industrial cities from which children were to be evacuated and in the reception areas. They learned that this personnel cannot be safely assigned to the Emergency Medical Service for work in casualty stations or first-aid units.

The readiness of parents to accept voluntarily the drastic measures for evacuation of their children was due to a considerable extent to their general knowledge that child health and school medical services would be available everywhere in the provinces as well as in the large cities. The government authorities knew that in practically every local jurisdiction they could count

on the existence of child health clinics, school medical service including treatment clinics for minor ailments, district nursing services, health visitors, trained, skillful midwives, prenatal clinics, hospital care and medical consultation for maternity patients. They knew too that a school meal program was in effect in at least 60 per cent of all local school systems and that free meals were available in 50 per cent.

Responsible health authorities said in February 1941 that in the rural sections of the counties used as reception areas for London children, no mother would have to go more than six or seven miles at the most to take her child to a child health clinic, and that the great majority could attend clinics within their own towns or villages. Obviously the sudden influx of children into a town or village, sometimes doubling the child population, would put a great strain on local health services. Supplementation of the local health workers by nurses, physicians, midwives, and child care workers or social workers from the evacuated cities proved to be one important way of meeting the pressures on the local staff. The nationwide, prewar child health service has made possible, as no improvised emergency service could, a program of health protection for children in the bombed cities and for those evacuated to the country that is, under the circumstances, extraordinarily effective and complete.

The wartime maternity program for women normally resident in London and other evacuation areas has been an outstanding success. The early decision to evacuate pregnant women who desired to go as one of the priority groups made it possible to develop plans long before war was declared. The selection, equipping, and staffing of premises suitable for maternity homes

not too far from the cities and usually in large country houses inevitably took time. Though some premises were selected early, insufficient funds prior to the declaration of war made it impossible for the Ministry of Health to equip and staff the new maternity homes far enough in advance.

When evacuation was ordered few of the maternity homes were ready. Confinements had to be arranged for in private households, and this did not prove satisfactory. With the declaration of war, funds became available, and maternity homes were quickly put in order. Not until bombing started, however, did they become very popular with London women. Then suddenly the demand grew until, by December 1940, 75 per cent of births which normally would have taken place in London were taking place outside the city. In February 1941, 90 maternity homes were in operation, each staffed with resident trained and experienced midwives, a resident physician, and, if there were more than 40 beds, a resident obstetrician. Furthermore, 30 additional maternity homes had been equipped and were being held in reserve. The success of this wartime maternity program can be traced directly to the high quality of the prewar nationwide service and to the skill used in adapting it to emergency conditions. It was everywhere recognized that the war situation was sufficient reason for exerting every effort to provide the best possible maternity care. The reward can be found in the continued decrease in the maternal mortality rate in both 1939 and 1940.

Second only to the contribution which these basic health programs made to the protection of children and mothers in wartime was that of the long-time development of nursery education methods and daytime

care of young children in nursery schools and day nurseries. At the outbreak of the war the number of nursery schools throughout the country was not large, but the principle of nursery education was well established and was in effect in the conduct of many of the day nurseries. Day nurseries already numerous in the industrial cities before the war have become even more so since the inclusion this year of thousands of women in the industrial war effort. The Ministry of Health and the Board of Education adopted the policy of employing teachers trained in nursery education methods as members of the staff of all wartime nurseries. This is evidence enough that the British people and their government are aware of the importance of this phase of child care to the future of the nation.

Nursery centers, which are usually modified nursery schools operated a few hours a day, were started for evacuated children soon after the first great evacuation in the fall of 1939. Today they are being developed more and more widely as essential community services in all reception areas. For an evacuated mother who is billeted with children in a private household, or who has her own quarters in a communal housing unit, the opportunity to take her young children to a nursery center for several hours each day may mean the difference between reasonable adjustment to her new surroundings or return to her home in the city. It was many months after war was declared before real impetus was given to the development of nursery centers for evacuated children and other wartime nurseries for daytime care of young children whose mothers were at work in industrial cities. Today, however, the movement is receiving strong support from the British government.

A word should be said at this point about the resi-

dential nurseries which have been established under the auspices of private agencies in large country houses for the care of children under five years of age whose mothers for good reasons could not leave the cities under bombing. Though 24-hour care of young children in groups is deprecated in England as it is here, the necessity of establishing such residential nurseries was seen even before the war was declared. Before the war, there was no widespread social work program of child placement for young children; and at the outbreak of war there were in the provinces almost no social workers who could select and supervise the great number of foster homes needed under the evacuation plans. This meant that it was impossible for the British authorities to consider a widespread plan of foster-home care of very young children in private homes.

At first, residential nurseries were established only to take care of groups of children attending private day nurseries or nursery schools in cities under bombing. Later parties of young children were made up from families who had been bombed out and whose mothers were working in essential industries and could not be moved. After the first evacuation in September 1939, the Maternity and Child Welfare Division of the Ministry of Health set standards of care in the residential nurseries. The standards regulated the number of children in any one group and their sleeping and play space; they established medical and nursing supervision and nursery school methods; they required the pasteurization of milk and provided for isolation facilities. The increased responsibility assumed by the government for these nurseries proved to be a great advantage, especially as the number of nurseries increased. Though the government now assumes practically all of the basic costs, private contributions continue to pay

for many extras, such as play equipment; and private agencies still operate the service.

Unlike the child health services, social services for children had not been universally established in Great Britain. Before the war, almost the only social workers who were trained primarily for work with children were the child care organizers attached to the London school system and the psychiatric social workers in the child guidance clinics. When the first evacuation took place, it was not appreciated what a fundamentally important role such well-trained social workers could play by assisting the authorities in reception areas, and by organizing community services for evacuated mothers and children.

Traditionally, volunteers had carried the responsibility of child welfare service, and many had received the training that long experience gives. For years, citizens had taken part in the affairs of government, as magistrates, aldermen, council members, members of education and of child care committees, and as child care committee workers. Women had been accustomed to giving considerable amounts of time to regular volunteer work of an important nature. Many women had had long experience in child care activities. It was natural that they should be called upon in time of war to assume new duties in the welfare field. As plans for the protection of children were drawn up and put into operation, nearly all responsibility for welfare services was placed by the government and by local authorities in the hands of volunteers. Even later, after a few trained social workers were assigned to the reception areas to be responsible for community organization and to develop social service work, volunteers continued

to carry the responsibility for most of the routine child welfare program.

About sixteen months before the outbreak of war, at the request of the government, one over-all organization of women volunteers—the Women's Voluntary Services for Civil Defense—was formed to co-ordinate this volunteer war work and to direct it into channels that would most effectively aid the government and all of its branches. The usual work of the many pre-existing women's organizations has gone forward so far as possible under war conditions to supplement in a great variety of ways the work of the W. V. S.

It was to the Women's Voluntary Services that the government turned to provide the welfare services for evacuated children and mothers and to organize community activities in the reception areas. The many detailed tasks were made the responsibility of volunteers under the direction of the local authorities. The day-by-day work included preparing for the reception of children; making surveys of local accommodations; keeping records; assigning children to private households and supervising their care; setting up hostels for temporary or permanent care of children; arranging for care of difficult children; finding and arranging with the health authorities for maternity homes and residential nurseries for young children; arranging with education authorities for setting up communal feeding centers, and with other local authorities for community social centers, nursery centers, communal laundries and sewing rooms.

On December 31, 1940, more than one hundred thousand women volunteers were assisting in the evacuation program. In February 1941 there were said to be between a million and a million and a half evacuated children and mothers under the government scheme.

For every ten to fifteen children, therefore, there was, on the average, one volunteer worker to carry out this work for the local officials and to assist the professional health workers. Without this army of volunteers the evacuation program could not have been carried out as successfully as it has been. All told some two and a quarter million children have been evacuated from the cities under bombing. In October 1941, the Chief Medical Officer of Health reported that more than a million were being cared for in reception areas under the government scheme.

The prewar lack of an adequate number of social workers trained in special service to children or in child guidance work is now recognized by the Ministry of Health to have been a real handicap in developing adequate welfare services for evacuated children in the provinces. It was not until after the great trek back to London had taken place, however, that it became clear that specific steps would be necessary to prepare the reception areas to absorb the evacuees into the life of the communities and so keep them from returning to the cities. The assignment of one of the child care organizers from London to a county health department in a reception area soon proved how valuable such a worker could be to the whole community organization plan, to mothers with individual social problems, and to the volunteers who were supervising the care given to children. The number of child care organizers who could be released from the London schools, however, was relatively small and could not meet the demand. The need for an enlarged training program was urgent.

The tendency for mothers to return to their husbands and families in the cities and the apparent need for more adequate welfare service in the reception

areas resulted, in November 1940, in the appointment by the Minister of Health, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, of a special committee to make an inquiry into the welfare of evacuated and homeless persons. The recommendations of this committee included among many other things the establishment of clubs and social centers for mothers, nursery centers, bathhouses and laundries, and week-end hostels for fathers and mothers. The appointment of more social workers (known as "welfare officers") by local authorities and the Ministry of Health was urged, to co-ordinate and stimulate all welfare activities.

A similar need for expansion of the child guidance clinics became apparent early in the war. Both in the cities under bombing and in the reception areas, demands for advice and assistance of psychiatric social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists increased rapidly. There was, however, insufficient personnel to meet the increased need. Psychiatrists in many cases had been taken into the army, leaving the other workers to handle the clinics alone. In a number of cases the demand for even a single worker was so great that either a psychiatric social worker or an educational psychologist was assigned alone to an area. The assistance given by these workers to teachers, volunteers, and health workers alike in the handling of "difficult children" in the reception areas was incalculable. There were and still are far too few of them to meet the needs. Since many of the children's difficulties were of a relatively minor nature, arising in many cases from the feeling of insecurity accompanying the separation from home, or as a recurrence of an earlier difficulty, the advice given to the foster mother or teacher by a child guidance worker often made an adjustment possible. Through their help

brothers and sisters were brought together, parents were advised about visiting, and many other situations were adjusted so that the child, or mother and child, remained in the country. When more serious psychotic conditions were found, the children were referred to the regular child guidance clinics or to psychiatrists at special interviews. As in the case of child care workers, the need for increased opportunities for training child guidance workers is recognized.

I have dwelt so far on some of the measures that have been undertaken by the British authorities for care and protection of children in wartime, and have attempted to give you an idea of how important in the wartime program have been the pre-existing health services, the nursery education program, and the welfare work of the volunteers. Though I have chosen to emphasize these particular phases of the work for children in Great Britain, there are many others that I might well have selected, for in all there are experiences that are of value to us. There are, for instance, the vexing problems of shelter life so unfortunate for children; the increase in delinquency and its causes; the development of recreation activities for older children and youth; the medical attention given to children about to be evacuated; the rehabilitation of the bombed-out and homeless families; the plan of education for evacuated children. It is not possible even to touch on these.

Before concluding, however, I want to remind you of the long process of planning and continuous readjustment that was necessary to make the program work. It was in May 1938 that the first evacuation plan was drafted by a Parliamentary Committee. A test evacuation at the time of the Munich crisis showed up its

many weaknesses, and resulted in the transfer of responsibility from the Home Office to the Ministry of Health, which is in charge of most of the government grants to local authorities. During the winter of 1938-39 careful plans were laid by the London authorities and by the Ministry of Health, with the result that when in September 1939 the first evacuation from London was ordered the process went off like clockwork. Approximately 1,200,000 children and mothers were moved to the country, and not a child was lost. At this time, however, the government had not realized how much more difficult was the job of the authorities in the reception areas, or how necessary it was to send children out from the cities clean and in as good physical condition as possible.

I have already pointed out the essential importance of proper community organization in the reception areas. I reiterate it, however, for the British authorities have found it to be the heart of the success of the whole program. Without it the return of the mothers with young children to the cities is practically inevitable. Without it children are underfoot in the houses of their hosts or footloose in the community. Without it delinquency among the older boys and girls increases. Without it private householders who have had children to care for now for months, or even in some cases years, can be given no respite or vacations. Without it difficult children cannot be given the help they need to enable them to take their places in the new environment. Without it existing health services could not have been strengthened to meet the increased burden of work that came with the evacuation.

There is much that we can learn from all of this to apply right here in the United States. Much of the British experience in community organization in the

areas receiving evacuated children could be applied to our boom towns and trailer camps. The need is great for child health clinics, maternity services, hospital care, social centers for the adults, community feeding places, community laundries and sewing rooms, more school facilities and recreation centers for school children, nursery centers for young children. In this country, where the population in many cities and towns and rural areas has doubled or trebled almost overnight, the need is as great as, if not greater than, it was in England.

If we should be faced suddenly with a more serious war situation than exists today and were forced to provide additional protective services for children in cities and other areas of potential danger; or to evacuate children and mothers from certain areas because of actual danger, we would be confronted with a task for which we are ill prepared. The deficiencies in child health and welfare services in the smaller towns and cities would suddenly become high-lighted, because these are the communities to which many children from the larger cities would have to be sent. Although there is little reason to believe that we in this country should ever find necessary such extensive movement of children as Great Britain has experienced, there is every reason why we should put our child health house in better order in all these communities and have ready the blueprints of a plan for emergency action in case it were ever needed.

With this in mind a small interdepartmental committee on health and welfare aspects of civilian evacuation was recently appointed jointly by the Directors of the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services. This committee, representing the Bureau of Public Assistance of the Social

Security Board, the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, and the Children's Bureau, has been instructed by the appointed officers to study the problem and report on suitable plans of procedure.

Experience with our current defense problems has made clear the health and welfare hazards to children that accompany the migrations of large numbers of people. These hazards would be far greater in the case of an evacuation of any considerable number of children and mothers resulting from military action unless careful plans had been made in advance and the supplemental facilities and services that would be essential to meet the needs of evacuated persons in reception areas had been provided. Fortunately, in any preparations that are made today for defense no steps need be taken that will not contribute to the health and welfare of children in normal times, no step need be wasted effort even though at the moment directed toward defense rather than toward normal orderly progress in the child health program.

The outstanding lesson to be learned from Great Britain is the need to plan ahead for the protection of children. It is one that is hard to learn. Experience in our defense areas today shows that we have not yet learned it. It is time that we really tackled the problem.

-

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN WOMEN .

by

Dorothy Canfield Fisher

HUMANITY on the march, as it always is, continually presses forward into new and unexplored country. Old bridges and well-built roads laid in past years over marshy places cannot be brought forward to serve again. Each new river, new ravine, new swamp encountered, must be conquered anew, by the spiritual and intellectual engineers of our race; and the role of engineer falls now to one and now to another division of our great human family.

But it is not enough to have each new bridge and new road made passable for marching feet. No matter how passable, it will not be used until heart and mind and imagination and habit have accepted it. The great mass of humanity will mark time on this side of a passageway, no matter how wide and open it lies, unless it has been trodden by many forward-moving human brothers and sisters. Until its use is established as a part of "human custom," has become habitual with a not too small minority of our race, the majority will not—apparently cannot—venture out along a new way into the future. Such seems to be one of the laws of human group life.

To be among those who have the imagination and force to open spiritually a way to the future which is already materially open, is one of the most honorable distinctions which can be earned by intelligent human

beings. And it seems to me that our period, and particularly this war emergency, has pushed and shoved women into a situation where they can, if they will, render this irreplaceably useful path-finding service for the majority of humanity which, instead of advancing over a perfectly open road into a future full of potential happiness and vigorous development along new lines, is still milling around in aimless confusion.

That future is almost wholly unexplored, yet it has been opened to us by a phenomenon almost tediously familiar to everybody: the shortening of the hours of routine work formerly done by the immense majority of people. We are all heartily sick of hearing about the industrial revolution, labor-saving machinery, and the division of labor. With the cortex of our brains (to use the modern jargon), "We know all that! We know all that!" But as to adapting the slow-moving body of "human custom" to profit by "all that"—no, toward that acceptance by our emotions, into our habits, of this literally miraculous transformation of our daily lives, we have scarcely made a beginning.

We still, most of us, go through the same kind of motions which were necessary for survival two centuries ago. We grind on the same millstones of habit the infinitesimally small amount of grain which can still be turned into food in those small old mills. Women still spend long hours every day at effort which they think of as "homemaking," just as their great-grandmothers did when long hours of work in the home were necessary for the health and survival of the family.

An objective research project about the time schedule of moderately well-to-do, married women living in New York suburbs was recently carried on by the research specialists of a thoroughly responsible foundation. It was found that, scattered through the day of prac-

tically every woman (except those who had at home very young children under the nursery school and kindergarten age) there were at least eight hours spent in—well, in nothing in particular—certainly nothing which seriously improved living conditions for the family. Those hours were spent in needlessly going there and back, of which there is a prodigious amount in modern life; in choosing, buying and taking care of possessions which, intelligently considered, did not in any way add to the health, happiness or value of the family life or even of the woman's own life; in such minute, cash-expending, time-consuming care of the person as the world has not seen since the new-rich parvenus of the late Roman Empire. I needn't go into more detail.

We all, alas! know how that priceless valuable extra time is squandered by conscientious, sincere, on the whole well-educated women. The wastage is too varied to catalogue here. The dramatically urgent demands for service of a nation at war may turn out to be the beneficent pressure to push such women off the dead center of apparent busy-ness and actual idleness, in which prosperity had involved them; may force them to realize that superfluous buying is not the same thing as useful work.

Each item of all "busy work" which made the day of the fairly well-to-do woman so full of "engagements" that she was tired at the thought of attending to them all, seemed different from each other item. Essentially, however, they were all based on the same activity—the spending of money. The women concerned had no idea of this, but, in reality, it was in order continually to consume goods that they were kept rushing from one engagement to another so fast as to be worn out at the end of the day; that they used up to no purpose those

eight extra hours which are enough for a full working schedule for an important coherent effort, intellectual, artistic or socially constructive.

This phenomenon was natural enough, and, in a way, nobody's fault. Our modern industrial society is in deep waters, in great trouble. It has found out how to manufacture goods with such magical power and prodigality that it might almost be rubbing Aladdin's wishing lamp. But as yet it has found no wishing lamp to distribute the results of its marvelous system of manufacture on a scale which can compare with its rate of production. In a great crisis such as this is, any straws are snatched at.

The amount of extra and superfluous fashion and luxury consumption of goods which high-powered advertisements can extract from middle-class women is pitifully small compared to the need for really adequate distribution of the vast amount of goods produced by industrial efficiency. But it is something. And it was being exploited to the peak of possibility. To own far more possessions than are needed, to take care of them when owned, to get rid of them as soon as they go out of fashion—such is the conception by commerce of the role of women in capitalism, such is the role constantly held up to them by the subtle skill and inexhaustible ingenuity of those propagandists of our times—the advertisement writers.

The ideal of the fascist order is the woman who is nonexistent except to produce boy babies to grow up to be soldiers. The ideal of the business world is the woman who is nonexistent except as a spender of money. Marriage used to mean for a woman, entering the field of working production and distribution inside a home. That is genuine creative life. The implication of modern propaganda is that marriage now means

for a woman becoming a constant buyer of possessions. That woman is held up to public praise who buys the most furniture, household gadgets, cosmetics, clothing, hats, shoes, automobiles; and she is constantly told by all the devices of our commercial propaganda that only thus can she be accepted by society and admired and cherished by acquaintances, hotel keepers, waiters in restaurants, stewards on ocean liners, passers-by on the street and other sound judges of human values. But as a matter of literal fact, buying is not a creative occupation: nor is caring for superfluous possessions productive effort.

To sum the matter up, this condition means only that organizing industrially the work which must be done in every society, created a vacuum in the homes of the families whose income was above the subsistence level. The vacuum having developed gradually, and human memory being short, the emptiness was not fully apparent to those personally affected by it. They continued in the vacuum, to make motions resembling those made by the highly skilled workers in the old-time home—which was a genuine center for the production of goods, for the distribution of produced goods to those who needed them, and for that variegated care of the young, the sick, and the aged which is now professionally performed. But, although the women in the home did not fully sense the vacuum, the commercial instinct of the time did. And it rushed to fill the vacuum by forced-draught buying of more goods than are needed, or than can be used without much extra effort to take care of them.

Put with these elements of the situation of modern women in an industrial democracy, two others and we will begin to see emerging a possible pattern for extremely useful pioneer initiative on the part of women,

in the present war crisis, which, breaking up the old routines, makes new ones possible. The first new element is that on the one hand the working hours spent by women in the home, and by those holding jobs, are greatly less than formerly and are becoming shorter all the time. The second is the work done in those hours (in the great majority of cases) is less and less creative, varied, and self-directed than work was in preindustrial days.

Very gradually, but very surely, the time taken out from ordinary lives by earning-a-living work is shrinking. As gradually, as surely, the work itself, the small subdivided job which falls to most people to do, is in less and less obvious relation to the whole of what society needs to have done.

Since the human race has, from the beginning of its history, found so much of its sure and enduring satisfaction in work, we are naturally moved hastily and warmly to deny that the day's work—that is, the earning-a-living work which we may agree to call the job—does not make such obvious sense to the worker as did preindustrial work. The minute subdivision of labor snips production up into such small processes, that almost no outside-the-home job *feels* as clearly useful and necessary, as all women's work used to be. And in her heart, every modern homemaking woman knows that what she does inside her home is not nearly so indispensable for the welfare of her family as what her great-grandmother used to do. In fact, a good many modern women have a notion, which they don't like to examine or think about, that far from helping to make her family strong, hardy, enduring, skillful, able and cheerful (as we all would like to see our children) a good deal of what she does as modern "homemaking" keeps them from being as strong, hardy, cheerful, able,

and all the rest, as they might be if she did less for them. The point is that what she used to do *for* the family in preindustrial days was to work *with* the family at producing the food, clothing and other necessities which they all used. That work together has, for the most part, disappeared. For the mother to buy things for the family is not the same thing. Nor can she find in the outside job which so many modern homemaking women have the same creative satisfaction as in her earlier occupations, because mostly that job is now only one tiny insignificant part of a hugely complicated process.

But at a rate almost exactly synchronized with the disappearance of real living interest from jobs, both in the home and out, the hours given to jobs have been shortened. Each industrial worker, in each day of his life, and each even moderately well-to-do homemaking woman too, has left over from the job about as much free time as half of our grandparents' working day. What are they doing with those many hours? What are they going to do with them? In actual practice, so far, both women in the home and industrial workers refuse to admit that they have any more free time than had earlier generations. First they hide this fact from themselves by cluttering up that free time by heterogeneous pseudo-occupations of no especial value, coherence or necessity. And secondly, they try to fill up the void with more of the purposeless "fun" or the passive pleasure of possessiveness than they had before.

What these women need of course is some valid substitute for the self-directed, creative, purposeful, skilled *work*, which has been taken away from them by the machine and the extreme division of labor, which together made *jobs*. To try to replace that work by buying, or by aimless pastimes, is a little as though

a person who hadn't bread enough to eat, and did have plenty of money, bought candy instead of bread. They have time to carry on any occupation they might choose. Why don't they choose something really worth while to do?

What is needed is an advance guard who will march forward together, along this new road to freely chosen work which has been opened to us by the modern shortening of the hours required by the job, but to which human emotions and custom and habit have not yet been wonted.

Perhaps what is keeping us, as a race, back, is a perfectly natural confusion of mind as to the part played in our lives by money. This confusion, which is perfectly natural, is the entirely mistaken and seriously dangerous identification of "work" with "job." A job is no more than work which you get paid to do. It is a terrible error to turn this around and to think that work which you don't get paid to do cannot be as important as a job, is not worth learning to do thoroughly and well—as well as if you were paid to do it. For this limits the *work* you can do to whatever *job* you may or may not be able to get. And unless, in all this extra time presented to you by the new organization of industry, you can really, seriously, practice some creative skill of value as people formerly were forced by necessity to do, you will fail to grow, as the years pass by, into a mature human being.

Why *should* you develop into full maturity? One reason is because only in that way can you take your rightful place among the useful members of your group. But a more compelling personal reason is that the very springs of enjoyment of life will dwindle to a poor scanty trickle if you don't. Nothing is more pathetic than the futile attempt of a woman, mature in years, to

go on enjoying only what suited her in youth. But what else can she do in her mature years, than to try to continue youthful occupations, if she has not developed in herself by arduous, coherent effort, the skill necessary to do something worth doing? For genuinely creative effort, of whatever kind is suited to one's personality, is the real joy of grown-up people—not play, or the acquisition of possessions.

What keeps so many women from acquiring this worth-while skill, actual, genuine skill, in some serious line of endeavor? The following false reasoning: Starting from the true premise that real skill can be acquired only by real work, they pass on to the mistaken idea that they can "work" only if they can get jobs. That is, that nothing is worth doing *well* if you don't get paid to do it, once you know how. There are some encouraging indications that this absurd idea is being undermined, in such modern phenomena as the growth of interest in gardening *well*, although no money is made by it; and, odd and almost perverse as this is, in a continually higher standard of skill in playing bridge, in spite of the fact that competence at the card table has, except for those who play for stakes, no cash reward.

But all too often women, who, in reality, are free to acquire by spontaneous effort the equivalent of professional ability in any line of activity they like, from landscape gardening to wood carving or cooking, are hemmed in by an imaginary vicious circle. This is made up of the knowledge that experience of actual work is essential to learn real skill, and the false idea that they can't have work experience if they can't land jobs. The notoriously unsatisfactory character of "volunteer effort" of all kinds is based on this ugly, materialistic and false axiom. Instead of stepping forward

along the broad open road leading to such wonderful, various, freely chosen skills and activities as have never before been available to our race, they fool around marking time, trying to use this free time as children do, for play—but not being children they can't.

The much talked about "dissatisfaction" of American middle-class women, in spite of their apparently "having everything," does them great credit. It shows that their personalities have not been permanently stunted by the absence during a couple of generations of the personality vitamins of real skill and the practice of it. It shows that their natures are sound and true enough to feel intensely (even though they don't consciously and articulately know) that owning material possessions and having their persons lacquered to a high finish are the poorest of substitutes for creative activity, whether it be the shaping of raw materials, or the refining to mastery of intellectual and artistic endeavor, or the improving of humanity's life in common.

Women who spend too much time and effort in buying, are not getting what every human being needs—the personal dignity which can come from nothing but the sense of being a genuinely and irreplaceably useful member of the group to which he belongs. They can have that dignity only if they acquire a genuine mastery of how to do something truly needed. Just activity—to which many American women are driven by their own vitality—is worse than useless, as is shown by the (suppressed) groans of professional workers in almost any field, when they are obliged to supplement their staff with "volunteers."

It is sheer nonsense to feel that there is anything inevitable in the connection between volunteer work and work badly done. Nothing is more needed by the human

race than some proof that human beings, *not forced to it by hunger or fear of need*, are capable of learning and practicing genuinely useful, vital skills. Here is "spiritual pioneering" in which women can lead, if they will show the capacity to discipline themselves, in the absence of compulsion from the outside. The usual machinery for supplying that compulsion—the school or college courses to be "taken," the examinations to be passed, the degrees to be hung around the neck as labels—was set up as a means to steady and push younger people into adequate professional skill. They are so inexperienced, so little practiced in self-discipline that they need to be led, driven, forced by the fear of not passing examinations, of not getting diplomas. But for mature human beings it is absurd to assume that unless they can put on the same harness and feel the hand of the driver on the reins, they can't move in the desired direction. They are perfectly free to go forward toward any goal they set themselves—if they will.

What they have needed is what every human being needs—so helplessly dependent are we on usage—some break in the small, circling round of accepted habit through which to escape. That such a break is often all that is necessary is proved by the way in which a natural calamity or emergency like a flood, earthquake, hurricane, fire, releases extraordinary and unsuspected stores of courage, endurance, determination and vitality in people astounded by their own latent powers. The man-made emergency and calamity of war also opens an escape for women from the unreal but imprisoning circle of habit based on the needs and customs of earlier days, not on our own present needs. But, like all opportunities, this is merely an open door. The only person to profit by it is the one who goes through the door to what is on the other side. What, in this case, is on

the other side, is a chance for women to prove the falsity of the notion that only in professional courses, preparing for earning-a-living jobs, can skilled ability be learned. This is a genuine superstition, as hampering to freedom of action as the belief in ghosts. It is a belief in ghosts.

By taking on any voluntary war work they are asked to do, and *while on the job*, giving themselves the best possible training and study to do it with increasing skill and ability, women will be doing themselves, personally, the greatest possible service. More than this, they will be advancing forward over a new road to new skills which in reality lies open to all, but which will not be used until habitual following of it by a large body of pioneers makes it seem "natural" to the majority of habit- and custom-ridden human beings. In serving their country, as every one of us must now want to do, women can provide proof that freely done work can be done as expertly as paid-for work: and as this chapter shows, such proof is one of the keys without which the human future cannot be unlocked.

In addition they will, as every honest and intelligent educator knows, be providing inspiration and an immense store of new material for improving the academic, professional "courses" which have been devised as training for skills. All educators know that such "courses" are full of padding, of repetition, of routine, of unreality. They are given in the vacuum of the classroom, to young people inexperienced in reality, unable to give their instructors valid criticism without which the practice of teaching, like any other art, deteriorates. In such professional training there is a tendency, deplored by educators who are worth their salt, to get farther and farther away from the actual facts which will be encountered by the young practi-

tioner of the art when he tries to use it in real life. The women war workers, on the job as voluntary workers, are in constant contact with that reality which is the finest possible teacher. If they will, they can secure very much better training from a combination of their acquaintance with reality and their mature minds, than they could have had in the classrooms of their youth.

How, after all, was "professional training" invented? Whether it be for the practice of medicine, law, engineering or teaching, professional preparation comes out of the experience with real facts learned by early practitioners, *as they worked*, from their first-hand experience with reality—just the kind of experience now open to women war workers.

Women are needed almost as much as men, in modern war, to serve their countries. But the extraordinary opportunity for epoch-making usefulness before them is not only to their nations, but to themselves, to generations of girls and women to come. And there is nothing in their situation which makes them incapable of taking full advantage of this opportunity. They are not unprepared as were Victorian women who, faced by the suddenly lessened need for work in the home, were incapable of fitting themselves for responsible adult activity outside the home because they lacked formal education in their youth. Our modern women have had, practically every one of them, as much factual instruction and intellectual training in the classrooms of their girlhood as anyone needs, to make them capable of going on with their own education. Firsthand, field workers' experience with reality has until now been restricted to people who hold paid jobs. War needs provide such experience to uncounted others. And that experience is the raw material out of which volunteer workers can, if they will, create professional

skill. Around anyone who is performing any actually needed work, is opportunity for learning vital skills and for practicing them with that sound, adequate expertness which, until now, we have absurdly felt to be somehow dependent on receiving pay for services.

But all this depends on the willingness and ability of women to make, of their own accord, the continuous, serious, attentive, coherent, long-continued effort without which no worth-while skill can be acquired, practiced, retained. The need of our country for our services puts us behind the steering wheel, the road open before us. Can we step on our own starters?

WOMEN AND WAR JOBS

by

Anna W. M. Wolf

THE morning after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, thousands of women crowded the rooms of the Red Cross, the offices of Civilian Defense and other women's volunteer organizations throughout the country. They had bought their war savings stamps and their bonds but it was not enough. What they demanded now was work—and in numberless cases work without pay. While thousands of women were seeking employment in arms factories because the family needed their wages, there were also thousands of others so placed financially that there was no such pressure, but who still wanted to help their country win the war. They wanted to do their share to preserve democracy—but also, if the truth were fully faced, to work because they themselves needed to. They were hungry for work, hungry to test and develop powers long dormant—hungry for usefulness on a new and more significant plane. America at war offered them a long-desired opportunity.

As time passed and no bombs fell near home, some of the hubbub subsided. Disappointment, confusion and routine chores were the lot of some who had secretly hoped for drama and excitement. These inevitably fell out and went home again—but a great many remained and today there is a growing body of

Reprinted by permission of Redbook Magazine.

women preparing themselves realistically to play a part in this grim thing called total war.

Who are these women? Where do they come from? What is happening to their traditional work as guardians of the hearth, rearers of families? The home has been called "democracy's first line of defense" and its well-being, the content and security within its walls, are what make it possible for the men on the battlefield and in the factory to carry on their work. Our children are our future. Their well-being is fundamental. How wise is it for their mothers to seek other work?

The highly important group of women who have left their homes to enter factory and industry are, for the most part, another story and cannot be discussed here. High wages and the chance to secure benefits for their families never before possible have determined their move. In most cases they have no choice. Economic necessity has forced them. Our questions then concern the woman who *has* a choice, who is in a position to decide whether or not she will give or sell her services outside the walls of her home. And we must add another question. How can she make her decision wisely? Home does come first. Children do need mothers—husbands, wives.

Most of the women who are applying for volunteer jobs today have some leisure and it varies in amount as their children's ages vary. Some have maids—others part-time help. Their husbands are likely to be away from home all day. Occasionally a grandparent or other grown-up relative lives with the family and helps with children and housework. Some women are natural-born cooks and organizers and have taught their daughters to be the same. With a household that runs along easily with everyone accustomed to pitching in and

helping there is time to spare. Most of them, however, are just run-of-the-mill, average housekeepers.

Not all women have small children. There are many homes where there are none, or where they are well launched in school or elsewhere, so that there are many hours a day when women are not called upon to be active mothers. The trouble with using their free hours to do constructive jobs outside their homes is that when older or adolescent children do need their mother they need her badly and nobody can take her place. Most women find that outside work—even war work—must be interrupted from time to time. Maybe a child gets sick, or a maid leaves, or the family moves, or the junior miss daughter needs help with a wardrobe or a party, or a son who “always got along so well and seemed so independent” clearly shows that he just needs more maternal time and attention and “knowing,” now that he’s almost grown up. Perhaps too a husband needs special help from his wife in his business. There are always a thousand unexpected calls on women—not because they are housekeepers, but because they are homemakers and responsible, before everything else, for the emotional climate in which the family lives. Keeping the home fires burning is their biggest contribution to total war.

Can women do both?

Usually it is a bad idea to answer sweeping questions with a clear yes or no. Answers need qualifying. But the more we look around, the more it appears that countless thousands of women *can* do both and are better off doing both and that they, their husbands, their children, the community and the nation will profit vastly for their rubbing elbows with all kinds of people and all kinds of problems other than domestic ones. There is mental and spiritual growth that comes from

extending one's usefulness in wider areas and family life is thereby stimulated and deepened. This, however, doesn't mean that there aren't other thousands who right now had better attend to their homes and nothing else. The point is, if you are a woman, to know in which group you fall. If you are to play a dual role and become both mother and worker, it will involve careful planning and you will need, besides, a lively sense of the relative values of the various courses open, especially the less tangible ones. Some women must be able to say cheerfully, "My particular home, at this particular year of my life, takes all my time and energy to do a fair job for the people involved. Here I stay, at least for the present."

And equally: "The truth is—a lot of the things I do are mere busy-work. It wouldn't matter a hoot if I didn't do them. There are hours of good hard effort in me that aren't being used for any significant end. Here's my chance."

Since each woman must decide in which category she belongs, I am suggesting a few guideposts. These are not rules of procedure and they do not begin to cover the multitude of considerations involved. They are offered humbly for no one can pretend to know all the answers.

1. Most women having four or five children or more still at home, and no domestic help, run a complicated enough life and have such continued demands on them that they are not likely to be able to do much else while the children are little. There are exceptions to this, however, depending on the type and temperament and circumstances of the individual women. Since the average number of children in American families of all income ranges is only between two and three, however, this will not apply to very many.

2. Even where there are one or two children below school age, and where limited help is available—no maid, no competent grandmother or nursery school—a mother may have *some* time left over for war work but it will not be much.

3. Where there is a very little baby—under a year or two—both mother and baby are likely to be much better off for seeing a good deal of each other. These early months lay the foundation for the quality of the future relationship; they are irreplaceable and they are gone before you know it. No “expert nurse” can ever replace the mother. Only by feeding, bathing, dressing, putting-to-bed, comforting, encouraging, and controlling a child does one really get to know him. “Playing with him” is only a small fraction of what he needs from his mother.

4. Often where there is a sick or specially handicapped child, or even just a difficult child who needs extra time and attention, or where there are old people in the family, invalided or semi-invalided, a woman’s hands are likely to be full. However, a certain amount of time, no matter how small, may well be spent at “outside” work, whether Red Cross, or serving on a committee or school board, and “getting out of it all.” In the end it may be that everyone profits.

5. When one’s home is in a small, sleepy town or in an isolated rural district where getting to centers of activity is almost impossible, war work is likely to be hard to find, though sometimes an enterprising woman “starts things” herself among the neighbors at hand. The American Red Cross in the nearest large town may be able to give advice.

6. Sometimes a husband’s business, the place or the farm needs a woman’s time so constantly that she has none to spare. There are also special kinds of husbands

who are so alarmed at the thought of their wives having any yearnings besides domestic ones and who manage to be so hostile or so obstructive to any other serious work that the game isn't worth the candle. Peace at home must be bought at any price.

There is then, a considerable group of women who are probably wisest if they make the happiness of the people in their homes their main "war work." The truth is that every mother discovers, no matter how efficient a manager she is, that a home is not a business, children are not jobs to be run merely on efficiency principles. Though we may borrow *some* business methods, a home is a place where the intangible and immeasurable values count most and where essentially the production of good humor and good spirits is the test of success.

But the fact remains that for many women an enormous void is created the day the door closes on her youngest child going off to school. To be sure there is the marketing to do, his lunch to be prepared for his return, the endless cleaning, the errands, mending and repairing, attentions to relatives, bridge club, dinner, husband, movies and entertaining now and then. Not only are there the routines, but the inevitable unexpected events that must be met.

But in admitting all these things let us be honest also. About half the things women do could be done in half the time or not at all. The cost and sacrifice of curtailing them are trifling as compared with time gained for other efforts. I say this as one who has seen countless women run attractive, economical homes that *are* homes, rear healthy, alert children with whose lives and problems they stay closely in touch and who nevertheless do regular work outside their homes. Since a woman's relation to her husband is every bit as im-

portant as her relation to her children, it should be added, as fundamental, that the relationship has not suffered. On the contrary, their husbands like them and their conversation better than ever. Housework and nothing else is a lonely business and a monotonous one. No wonder we feel stale and act stale.

So I am hoping that a lot of women who never knew they had it in them (or who were a little bitter about it because they always suspected they *had*) are going to discover in war work and in doing simple, useful things for their communities responsibly and well, a newer and better way of life which will not end when the war ends. I believe that work for women is an old, not a new thing and that they have been deprived of much of it by having far fewer children than formerly and by many other developments of modern life that have taken much of the preparation of food and clothing as well as education of the young out of their homes. Women need to rediscover themselves through finding new work. When they do many false values will be sloughed off and men and women will meet each other with increased respect for each other and with deepened love.

Here then are some suggestions for the women who can and should look for an active part in the national crisis.

1. Women will do well to make up their minds to start with what tasks they can cut out or cut down on. It will be better if these are *not* time spent with husband and children but have rather to do with *things* and *possessions*—the non-essentials. Food, for example: Meals are often unnecessarily large and fussy. Canned goods, frozen foods, pressure cookers and other modern gadgets save time. They may cost a little more.

The cost should be calculated carefully and plans made to go without something else if possible, to pay for it.

The same with clothing. Women who like to sew and mend can do it in odd moments. Store-bought clothes, curtains, linens, slip covers are usually better than homemade ones. Chain stores carry many garments cheap enough to justify discarding instead of mending.

Every woman who works outside her home has to reckon on increased home expenses. It costs to be a volunteer! But it need not be *much* more and is likely to be well worth it. If a maid is employed it is usually good economy in the end to pay top wages and get the best. She can then be encouraged to take more and more responsibility.

2. Marketing time can be cut to far below the time usually absorbed by it. A working woman can take her butcher or grocer into her confidence. She can explain that she has a regular job which limits her time, and ask his help for speeding up the buying process. A list mailed to him the night before, will help him to use odd moments to get the order ready. Price and quality will have to be watched but that needn't take too much time and women who have a telephone should use it now and then to save time and fatigue.

Maids in families who have them can be taught to do the marketing and meal-planning and perhaps to keep the accounts. Yes, they *can* learn and it will have the further good effect of increasing their value in any position they take.

It is important to have a large enough icebox and store closet so that it is possible to buy ahead and store. Running to the store every day is not necessary. Other shopping and errands too can be limited to one afternoon a week.

3. Lots more things can be done co-operatively with friends or neighbors who are also interested in reducing the *mechanics* of living and freeing themselves for other work. It is wasteful to take one or two children to school where the family still has a car; five or six from the same neighborhood can go, and the parents take turns driving. In many cases too, you can help each other out with the children. Jim Kennedy comes to Mrs. Smith's house for lunch on Thursdays, and the Smiths' Dickie goes to the Kennedys' on Mondays. This gives each mother a lunchless day. Staying with children evenings can sometimes be worked co-operatively too. Jane and Sue are bosom friends. How they love to sleep at each other's houses and it's a good experience even when they're little! Turn about is fair play and it may mean a carefree Friday night alternate weeks for their parents.

4. The cleaning? There it is, just a horrid reality! Not even the most ardent patriot or career woman can really tolerate a dirty house. It gets you down like nothing else. The first principle, however, is to eliminate the hundreds of unnecessary and rather unattractive gadgets that accumulate in homes, crying to be dusted. If magazines are kept cleared out and children's toys and junk sorted and disposed of periodically, keeping their room neat becomes simpler. The "anti-macassar" and "whatnot" types of thing should be dealt with ruthlessly. Charm and hominess won't be sacrificed, with fresh flowers whenever possible and far fewer objects it will be surprising if a home doesn't gain in style and restfulness. Another very important point. There are always certain women who in a zeal for cleanliness are much *too* clean. Each woman should decide what chores can wisely be left undone.

5. I have left children for the last because of course

they and the husband are the crux of the whole question. A meal spoiled is just a meal spoiled, but neglect of a human being who needs a wife or mother can be irreparable. There are certain times of day most fruitful for developing these relationships and work arrangements should be made with these in mind. From five o'clock until bedtime is likely to be such a time. Children need playtime and conversation, help with homework, with bathing and going to bed. They need help in the morning too, but if one must choose it is these going-to-bed hours that are most strategic. Saturdays and Sundays are days in which children's and family friends need to be made welcome or when trips and special events are planned and 'summer vacation when school is out should be made way for. If one elects morning for the particular war work one has chosen then probably breakfast should be cleared away and beds made before leaving. Marketing can be done on the way home again—then cleaning and dinner. There are as many different schedules as people but in the main it holds true that where there's a will there's a way. Even young children can be taught to lend a hand in housework and older children of both sexes certainly should. It is healthy and characteristic of many American homes for husbands, too, to take a turn at getting Junior to bed or wielding a dishcloth. With less money to spend (taxes) and fewer automobiles (rubber) it looks as though the family's going to have to spend more time together anyway.

Another point. Families with maids will do well to turn the housework over to her whenever possible, but not the children. This goes for the family with cook, butler and nurse as well as the one with a part-time "girl." The nurse or girl is best used to help out the mother not to supplant her in the fundamental man-

agement of the children. This is the only way in which a mother really learns to know her children and their needs, and in which she can avoid feeling guilty during the hours when she is running a canteen service miles away.

War work itself of course takes many forms and only future events can instruct us where women will be most needed and do their best work. Good schools, hospitals, day nurseries, housing projects, recreation centers—whatever makes a town a good place for munition workers' families to live in—are adding to our national strength and safety as truly as first-aid courses and air-raid warden duty.

One mother of a family whose husband in the army was called to duty went to live with her own parents on a very small budget. She needed to earn and to earn quickly and was equipped with nothing but a college degree, and a taste for Shakespeare. She decided, however, to do the simplest and most obvious thing. She learned acetylene welding and got a job in an arms factory. She rose at six every morning, acted as an alarm clock for her sleeping children forty minutes later, kissed them good-by in their beds and was at the factory by seven. At four she was home again in time to be with her children when they came home from school and to assist her mother who managed the home and meals. Once or twice a week she and a friend and the oldest boy went to early evening movies together. It was a strenuous life and for the first few weeks she was exhausted. Later she got into her stride; her interest in factory matters grew. She liked her fellow workers and she learned much about labor unions from a totally new angle. She also made a point of keeping in touch with her children's life at school. Just before starting the job she made friends with a teacher who

proved interested and sympathetic to her problems. There followed occasional telephone calls from mother to teacher and thus she was kept in touch rather more than most mothers with how her children seemed to be getting along between nine and three. This choice may not seem a practical one where the mother of a family *can* choose. But a factory job is directly useful and remunerative and can be a vital experience for white-collar girls and college graduates. As time goes on, the imperative call, even for women with leisure, may come from just such jobs.

With new work and urgent work on which vital things depend there are many things that are likely to drop out of women's lives entirely. If afternoon bridge and mahjong parties were to disappear "for the duration" I suspect it would be a great relief to countless women who would so prefer real work once they had it that they would never again go back. The same is true of the dainty and time-consuming little luncheons they serve each other—so well-mannered on the surface, so desperately competitive and striving to keep up with the Joneses at bottom. Shopping (now enormously and unnecessarily time-consuming) would be compressed so that it is no longer, as now, a major sport. Old-fashioned social gatherings in homes and the art of neighborliness might have a chance of resurrection and all of us would be better off for it. A great many women are going to find they have capacities and satisfactions they never dreamed of and will wonder how on earth they used to spend all their time.

Above all, it is important not to minimize the difficulties. Women's work is almost by nature irregular. For it is the women who will always be called upon when routines break down and the unexpected happens at home. As a result, women's work should never be

expected to proceed with the same mechanical efficiency as men's. But once this fact is accepted by women themselves and the community at large there is still an enormous amount of useful work they can and should do. In doing it, they will become more satisfied human beings and therefore better wives and mothers. If the war can awaken us all to the discovery of the great unused potentialities of women and can help them to distinguish their real work from busy-work and frittering, there will at least have been a silver lining to what at the moment appears a very black cloud indeed.

THE ADOLESCENT AND HIS PROBLEMS TODAY

by

Caroline B. Zachry

WITH little children only dimly aware that something strange is going on in the world, with older children thinking of the war as a huge game, with adults more or less adjusted to a world in which even this can happen, adolescents are more profoundly effected by the war than any other group. The child goes on playing his games and he goes on believing that *his* school and *his* home form the center of the universe. The mature adult goes on working and he goes on believing that there are things worth striving for in this world and there are things worth saving even though death and destruction, cruelty and selfishness seem at present to overshadow everything else. But the adolescent feels that the foundations of his universe have changed overnight.

Some adolescents feel that it is silly and futile to keep on going to school, to study history, art, and economics with the end of civilization in sight. Some resent being treated like babies when there is so much vital work to be done. Or they feel guilty because they are sheltered and cared for while youngsters their own age are fighting and working for their country in other parts of the world. Some are just restless—vaguely excited by all the war news, or intrigued by the wonderful new opportunities for young people to earn money these days.

Some are frightened and bewildered, but ashamed to turn to their parents for comfort and reassurance.

Living in a no man's land between childhood and adulthood, having no clearly defined status of his own, the adolescent finds it hard to know just what he is. Even in normal times it is hard for him to figure out what his rights and privileges are, and harder still for him to know what is expected of him. Neither children nor adults, adolescents can be forced to be one or the other by us—their elders. And we do, unconsciously for the most part, actually force them to be one or the other depending on what we want from them at the moment, on how they can best serve our purposes.

Without status in the eyes of the adult world, young people have for some time been buffeted about by the chance winds of social demand. In the early days of our history, because their abilities were needed and therefore welcomed, boys and girls were encouraged to take an important part in the common life. Alexander Hamilton was nineteen when he wrote his two pamphlets setting forth the rights of the colonists. Lafayette was the same age when he came to the aid of the Americans. Nathan Hale had been a schoolmaster and a captain when he was put to death at the age of twenty.

Later in American history, during the development of the West, young men and women at an age when they would now be considered mere children were acknowledged to be capable of marrying, setting up their own families, and playing an important and constructive role in the communities in which they lived. Even boys as young as twelve and thirteen were thrust into positions of adult responsibility.

During the next century, technological advances made the work of children progressively less needed and

economic advances made it possible to give them more schooling. As a result of these two factors, boys and girls were segregated more and more from community life and were treated as children till a later and later age.

Then suddenly, during the last war, young people once more had "greatness thrust upon them." Youth was idolized, not because the glories of youth had suddenly been discovered for the first time but because, as in the pioneering days, boys and girls were badly needed. Boys were needed to work and to fight the war. Girls were needed for work and because they were important to the boys. Early marriages were romanticized and, in many cases, financed. Every young person was supplied with a ready-made and highly glamorous mission in life. All of them were made to feel that they were tremendously important to the country, the center of American society.

Readjusting to everyday life after the war, becoming just ordinary citizens in a humdrum existence, proved too much for a great many of them. That post-war period is still close enough for us to remember the emotional disturbances and the general mood of disillusionment among young people, leading in many cases even to suicide.

With the coming of the depression, we went to the other extreme. After forcing the adolescent to grow up fast, we turned around and encouraged him to remain a child just as long as possible. We have been doing this consciously and unconsciously and for a number of reasons.

Consciously, we were afraid to have him enter community life while he was still so young. Particularly if he were our own child, we minded seeing him grow up too soon and too fast. We felt that the problems

and burdens of the outside world were more than he could endure and so we pulled him back, protected him, kept him from taking a real part in the community, guarded him from being hurt by it.

This protective attitude has become stronger and more prevalent as families have grown smaller. With fewer children on whom to lavish their love and care, parents have tended to give their one or two children more than their share of solicitude. Particularly in recent years, when young hands were a drug on the market, it seemed kinder and wiser to keep boys and girls in school—educating them, endlessly preparing them for the time when they would eventually take their place in the adult world.

But parents are not the only ones who have kept today's adolescents infantile. Other adults, unconsciously perhaps, have been afraid that with youngsters growing up, they themselves would be pushed out. They do not like the feeling of being middle-aged, the feeling that these boys and girls are coming in to take their places. The adolescent has, therefore, not been made to feel wanted or needed. On the contrary, his growing up, his need for a job, his wish to marry, all constituted a threat to adults who, in their turn, were uncertain of their place, and who were so anxiously concerned about their own safety that they considered it advisable to keep the adolescent a child as long as possible. Whatever reasons we gave, it has actually been to our interest to keep boys and girls infantile since the depression to prevent their competing for our own jobs.

Yet now, with our country at war, the temptation is to shift our attitude completely—to do again what we did in 1918; suddenly to consider the girls women because the boys need them and there is work for them to do; to give college degrees in three years instead

of four; to encourage early marriages and to finance those marriages.

If we did this we would once more let them grow up, not in terms of *their* best interest, but of our own. Once more, during the national crisis, we would exploit youth, we would use them according to our needs regardless of whether this is best for them. But a lot of thinking has been going on between the last war and this one, a lot of thinking about America's young people. Government and private agencies alike have spent millions in the study of youth problems and it is not very likely that we will go ahead and work in terms of the emergency while disregarding all that we have learned.

At the present time we are able to plan emergency measures and still take into account the needs and interests of our boys and girls. It won't cost any more to handle them in terms of their own needs and with wisdom and understanding than to exploit them. And in the long run, when the emergency is over, we know that we are going to have saved tremendously in human values if we have planned, if we have taken into account the actual needs of young people.

Adolescents, we know, want primarily three things. They want a chance to work. They want the possibility of marrying while still quite young. They want a sense of significance in their lives.

A job may be to a young person, as to any person, first of all an economic necessity. There are, of course, thousands of boys and girls whose economic circumstances demand that they be partially or wholly self-supporting or that they supplement the family income. Apart from economic considerations, however, there are others which may be just as impelling to youth.

To compete successfully in the adult order, to trade his abilities for due compensation is a means, in the adolescent's eyes, of proving himself. It constitutes a sort of demonstration of personal adequacy—and of a sort highly prized in American culture. Moreover, to a very large extent, financial independence signifies to the adolescent, and to his parents, the final step in the process of emancipation from home.

Such are the potential satisfactions in a job *per se*. The conditions of the occupation and the nature of the work to be done may offer various satisfactions in themselves, such as those to be found in good workmanship or in the constructive use of aptitudes. Some types of work may satisfy deeper emotional needs. An occupation may in fact attain significance for a given person, not only as determining what he will do but as determining what he will *be*.

To many an older adolescent, a job is also the prime factor in determining whether or not he can get married. For those thousands of young people joblessness means frustration, not only of their ambitions in the business and professional world, but frustration of their psycho-sexual desires as well.

Of course, in many boys and girls the desire for marriage is confused with their desire for status and prestige. In girls particularly, the desire to establish a home assumes disproportionate importance in their eyes and they hope to marry primarily in order to gain a secure, respected place in the community. Others, boys and girls alike, are concerned chiefly with the meaning of marriage as an escape from the dependence and restriction of the parental home to an independent establishment. Many are scarcely aware that they give all this significance to marriage, but others consciously long and deliberately plan for it partly on such grounds.

Similarly, some young people look toward marriage as an escape from one or another of a variety of emotional problems. Disturbed or confused in their attitude to people, or anxious about their personal adequacy, they may think of marriage as an opportunity to make a fresh start, even as the beginning of a new life. It is evident that in these circumstances a young person is expecting far too much of the marriage relationship. He is doomed to bitter disappointment in his actual marriage unless he can, without too much heartbreak, make the necessary readjustments.

It would be far more satisfactory, however, if we—parents and educators and miscellaneous adults alike—would recognize that our task is much more than that of enabling young people to get married by helping them to become financially self-sufficient. We must also help them to achieve more mature attitudes toward marriage in general and toward their own roles in their own prospective marriages.

As a minimum essential, boys and girls must have ample opportunities to get to know one another. Each boy and each girl should know enough members of the opposite sex—and to know them well enough—so that they can recognize the difference between momentary attraction and lasting, developing love. They should also have the opportunity to know one another under many different kinds of circumstances. The work camps for boys and girls have made a definite contribution toward this end. Here young people have not only learned how to work at various types of tasks and how to take responsibility for carrying a project through, but they have also learned how to get along with one another. They see how they themselves react to difficult problems and trying circumstances. They see how their friends—both boys and girls—react.

Young people from widely separated sections of the country and from widely divergent home backgrounds, through working together and living together, achieve an understanding of themselves, of each other, and of basic human relationships.

Besides having social and other contacts with boys and girls of their own age, adolescents should be brought into closer contact with those slightly older than themselves. If friendships were encouraged between older adolescents and newly married couples, boys and girls could learn more about marital problems and marital adjustments than can be learned from the best marriage courses in the best high schools and colleges in the country.

With a wide knowledge of people, with a realistic approach to love and life, young people can go forth toward marriage hopefully—and with a hope well founded. Those young men and women who are not deeply disturbed, who have on the whole worked out in satisfying ways appropriate to adolescence their basic life adjustments can, through marriage, work out further more satisfying and socially useful adjustments in young adulthood. In family life, these young people may find a security that is not merely a refuge, but one that liberates them for further creative self-realization through this and other relationships.

The third thing that adolescents want and need, the thing that I have called "a sense of significance in their lives," can be achieved very largely through satisfying work and a satisfying marriage. But, in addition to that, young people want to take part as citizens in the affairs of the community. To be active, on however small a scale, in the affairs of state and nation signifies acceptance in adult society in a fuller sense than does the attainment of economic independence. Moreover,

some young people look toward community participation as one means of satisfying in an adult context the longing to be part of a larger whole.

This longing, while it may be considered a "young" emotion comparable to the ten-year-old's desire to be part of a gang or secret society, is not one to be ignored in the hope that it will pass. If it does pass, if our adolescents in large numbers grow into young adults who are perfectly content to be interested in their own work, their own love lives and nothing more, society stands to be the loser.

The past few years have made it increasingly clear that the participation of young people in the common life is needed for a desirable development of society, for the very preservation of democracy.

Adolescents are both aware of this need and of their ability to serve it. That is why, taken as a group, they are full of hope and courage, despite the social problems which press upon them. They recognize the value of their potential contribution and are confident that their efforts will effect necessary changes and a better future. Endowed with a vitality and optimism which are attributes of their youth and their growing physical adequacy, seeing the difficulties with eyes which have not become blurred by discouragement and prolonged failure, they are eager to attempt a solution of those problems. They are eager for that chance. Can they be made ready for it?

Since the growing individual must learn to adjust himself to society, it is accepted as the fundamental purpose of education to help him in this process. This does not, of course, necessarily mean that he must learn to accept the world as he finds it. But, before he can ever hope to participate in modifying and improving

society, he must face it as it is, adjust himself to it, and try to understand it.

Education can take a limited but nevertheless a very important share of the responsibility for meeting the needs of the adolescent—for helping him to understand himself and his world. On the physical side, the school can offer courses in human physiology, in order that adolescents may be helped to understand the physiological changes taking place in themselves. Social science courses may help adolescents to understand social and economic processes and changes. The study of literature can contribute both to this understanding and to insight into the emotional forces motivating human behavior.

But no matter how valuable its contribution, the school cannot make up for lack of acceptance and status in the community, particularly for the older adolescent. Boys and girls must be able to think and to *know* that they are really making a worth-while contribution to the community problems. In these times certainly we can find a place for our young people in our preparations for defense and in actual war work. Under war conditions, adults are needed and demanded, and our eager conscientious youth is going to meet that demand. War forces boys and girls to grow up almost overnight and we must watch without interference while their capacities develop at breath-taking speed. The more responsibilities they can assume, the more naturally can they and their families accept their sudden maturity. Those still in school should have definite courses directed toward war and relief training and should have jobs in the community and at home that will satisfy their urge to be of service and their need for adult responsibility.

It is very interesting that with all our talk about

youth we have hardly ever joined with them to do anything about their situation or recognized openly the value to the community of their services. It is high time we let these young people come in and plan and work with us, not only that they may have a sense of accomplishment but because we definitely need them.

Democracy requires the vision and enthusiasm of its young people as urgently as those young people need a democratic society in which to develop. For democracy cannot be conceived except as a form of reciprocity whereby the individual is permitted to develop his powers to the fullest in order that he may, by them, promote the welfare of a group which makes possible and insures a right to the pursuit of happiness for himself and his posterity.

ATTITUDES OF YOUTH AND MORALE

by

Eleanor D. Roosevelt

IT SEEMS to me that this is a pretty large subject, for the attitudes of youth are as varied as the number of young people; all young people have different attitudes, I think.

One day, while in the office of Civilian Defense, they brought in a number of manuals. I know nothing about manuals, nothing about the subject matter that goes into them, but the name of the top manual caught my eye—it said, "Overall Manual." I wondered, what is an Overall Manual? I promptly said that I would look at that manual and I gave a copy to someone else at the same time. I read it; and the other person read it—brought it back to me with the remark, "It seems to me there are a great many words, but they don't say anything." Well, I felt the same way. There were a great many words but they didn't say a thing.

That is like what a great many of us do when we talk about youth attitudes and morale, because, as a matter of fact, most all youth attitudes stem from the attitudes of older people; not always from parents, sometimes from their teachers, sometimes from older friends of the family. It is commonly said that a great many attitudes stem from their own friends. I am not so sure of that.

I think that older people have a great deal of influence on youth attitudes; but there are certain things

we may find in many of the young people themselves. I might just touch on a few of those.

One could say that one very prevalent attitude in youth is the desire to do, to stop talking about things and thinking about things and actually to do something. I think that is really one of the reasons why you hear people are troubled by the morale of boys in camp. I have never been very much troubled about that because when young people actually have something to do, they stop fussing and that is what the great majority of the boys are doing. Since we've been in the war this is proved to be true, for morale is high everywhere.

I don't mean to say that there aren't some young people who have some real fundamental difficulties in their thinking, who show confusion, or antagonism to certain things that are happening.

I came up on the train with a few of them the other day. I sat at a table with three who had been in training some months; two were draftees, one was an enlisted boy. We talked together and their dissatisfaction soon expressed itself. One complaint was that they hadn't enough materials to feel that they were really learning a great deal; the other complaint was that they had had their lives interrupted and had to stop doing something. They found that now all they thought of was food and the date they would receive their pay. Nobody talked to them about what was happening in the world. They couldn't really see that they were doing much. I think that is the psychology of all young people not only over the past few months, but at all times. Now they know there is a job to do, they are happy.

Mr. Lindeman refers to the failure of democracies

to teach youths a sense of responsibility. Perhaps this is really due to the fact that in our modern life there are a great many young people who can't actually see that they are getting anywhere. I don't know whether that is so or not, but I get that from young people now and then. They may be doing the kind of job that doesn't seem to them to be accomplishing anything. Nearly all youth desire to be doing something that they see is constructive, something that grows, that goes on and develops and is a pathway which they can follow, and which leads to widening horizons.

As we look back, I think we will realize that that was so for our young people in the past. I always liked the story of my husband's grandfather who, when he was seventeen, was driven up to Boston by his father and put in a countinghouse, and shortly afterwards became a supercargo on a ship that sailed around the world. At the age of eighteen he was in charge of the cargo: sold it and bought new cargo; and what happened to that trip was partly his responsibility. He could see something developing before him as he went and he saw new countries, new opportunities.

That illustrates what, I think, we have got to do for this younger generation of ours. We have got to think about their attitudes in the light of providing them with widening horizons because one thing I feel is sure: they will not have a satisfactory attitude toward life unless they feel they are growing, and through their own work, developing new things, developing things that lead to something which most of them term rather vaguely "a better world."

Almost any group of young people you talk to will say that they want to help build a better world. They

couldn't chart for you that better world. It is a phrase that they have become attached to, nevertheless. It expresses the real thing they are seeking; it is the thing that really means the aspirations of youth today.

They have many attitudes beyond that which we could talk about, some that I think are very encouraging. I would far rather put a question of tolerance up to a group of young people than I would to a group of older people. I think there are very few young people who hold the attitude today of some of my older friends who, partly because they don't realize it, have become fixed in certain prejudices. These older people don't think about it very much, but it comes out sometimes in word and in deed, without any thought on their part at all. But such prejudices and intolerance offend youth. I think that is one of the very encouraging signs of the attitude of youth.

I am not a bit afraid about the morale of our young people. I am much more worried that we older people won't keep up our morale so that we can really supply the proper background for the growth of young people. We are the ones, probably, who are going to lack courage; and of course we are the ones who are responsible in many ways for not opening wider horizons for our young people.

I have always remembered a story which I think Dorothy Canfield Fisher wrote about a girl who went back, after she had been around the world, to the place where she used to go in the summer. The farmer's family asked her to stay because they thought they would find out some new things from her. She had traveled all over the world but she had learned nothing that she could impart to anyone else because she had always been turned inward, she had never been turned

outward. In her background, no one had ever taught her to understand the things she saw. So she was able to travel in Europe and come back and give nothing to the young people in the family with whom she went to stay. She had a rude awakening when she overheard them talking about her and saying that they had only taken her in because they had hoped for new horizons and that she seemed not to know anything about anything that was important.

I have felt that way about a great many people. I have taken a good many people into different parts of this country to see different situations and found, rather to my surprise, that they could see a great deal—and understand nothing.

One day I was asked by a group of young people if I would tell them something, some human stories about actual people that I had happened to tell to one of them. I told them with considerable misgivings, thinking that in all probability the attitude of youth would be rather cynical. I feared youth would say, "Oh, why be concerned about that? That is just a local thing. They are not really people to bother about. They just weren't any good and that is why those things happen to them." Instead of which I heard that afterwards one of them had made a remark which I have never forgotten because I think all of us who are older were more or less under indictment. This boy said, "You know, I never had heard about any of those things until this afternoon. I didn't know they existed anywhere in my country. I wonder why my mother never told me about it before."

So you see that perhaps some of the attitudes of youth come from our own attitudes. Perhaps we are the ones who really bear the responsibility for teaching the things which will create a sense of responsibility

in youth. We can't expect, of course, that youth will have gray hairs, or that youth will constantly think about the serious things in life. In fact, it would be rather sad if that were the case. But I think we can open doors to youth which will create the morale we worry about so much. For it will give them an understanding of the whole of life. It will give them a real sense that they are a part of the whole, that they are not confined to one particular little individual situation, that they are a part of this whole flow of life which is going to change, change for us, change for the rest of the world, and which is going to mean that our young people, willy-nilly, must carry a great burden of responsibility.

Since our country was attacked and we became involved in war, there has been, of course, a complete change in the morale of the men in camps and of the civilians at home. Boys and girls are clamoring now to do the thing which will make them most useful to their country. Many of the boys are enlisting in the military services because of the urge to do something. They do not stop to consider whether their ultimate value to the country would be enhanced by finishing their education first.

The country calls and a vast majority of youth answer; but the country calls for an intelligent answer. That does not mean giving up the courses of study already embarked upon, if the country will benefit by the intervening months of better preparation, or special training.

I think all young people must make an effort to take a very practical attitude concerning their desire to be of service. They should pick out carefully the place where their services will be most useful, and prepare

themselves to give their best in whatever they decide to do.

It is our task to give the young people the background of courage, intelligent leadership, and confidence that they can carry the responsibilities and have the morale, no matter in what situations they are.

THE OUTLOOK OF YOUTH IN A WORLD AT WAR

by

Howard Yale McClusky

TO SPECIFY the attitudes of youth with any degree of reliability requires an omniscience to which the writer makes no claim. People differ and *young* people are no exception. With what assurance can we assume identical attitudes on the part of Alpha Delts at Williams College, negro youth of Coffee County, Alabama, residents of the N.Y.A. center at Cassidy Lake, Michigan and young people on the farms of Box Elder County, Utah? How much unanimity is there among members of the Junior Farm Bureau, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Executive Board of the American Youth Congress, the Newman Clubs and the Junior Assembly of the Young Men's Christian Association? Obviously we cannot speak of youth with a capital "Y" and ascribe a viewpoint which uniformly characterizes the attitudes of all young people regardless of educational level, cultural background, aptitude, and racial origin. On the other hand, because of their period of development, and the impact of certain socio-economic conditions upon their status, young people are likely to share an outlook more characteristic of their age than of the older generation.

One cue to understanding the outlook of youth is their attitude toward the future. On the whole, youth

are optimistic. They are optimistic because time is on their side and they know it. They may fail once at some task, but they have time to try again. They may be blocked at the end of one road, but they have time to start down another. They may make a poor decision, but they have time to correct its consequences. They may make a mistake, but they rarely regard it as final. While there is life there is hope and since most of life lies ahead, youth are full of hope.

Another factor in the optimism of youth is the favorable ratio between their powers on the one hand and their responsibilities on the other. Physically they are attaining their peak. They have strong bodies. If feelings are largely conditioned by physical background, young people should be expansive. Moreover, their native intelligence is mounting. Later years contribute stability to judgment, but the capacity for acquiring information and using intelligence comes to a peak sometime in the late teens or the early twenties. Thus the native powers of youth are large. But their duties are still relatively slight. Most of them have not married, and those who have, have not had their quota of children. As a consequence they are not yet taxed by the full demands of family life. Furthermore, one group of youth have not yet started to work, while the remainder are just beginning their occupational careers. In addition, their roles as members of the community are not yet fully developed. They are members of few well-established organizations and have not been fully taken into the councils of their elders.

It would not be true to say that young people have no responsibilities; but they have not yet attained their full complement of duties as parents, job holders, and citizens, which brings us back to the main theme—namely, that youth occupy a stage in life when the

ratio between their powers and the demands upon their powers is most favorable. Never before have they been and never afterwards will they be, equipped with a greater surplus of physical and mental capacities over and above the requirements of society. No wonder young people are optimistic. They feel the surge of new strength and have yet to experience the full test of life. They face the future with hope. Of such stuff has the dynamic will-to-live always been compounded, driving each generation of youth on to override the weary disillusionment of its elders and advancing the outposts of society to new frontiers.

Historically, America has been the land of hope and therefore the land for youth. From decade to decade it has supported an expanding economy and has been justly proud of its ability to absorb the steady flow of youth into its midst. But in recent years dramatic socio-economic changes have been taking place. These changes have been so profound that the assimilation of youth has been more seriously dislocated than at any other time in the history of the nation. In the early days of the depression this dislocation was particularly severe. Finding no work, large numbers of youth began to pile up in their communities. Not content to stay at home in idleness, other young people took to the road, thumbing for automobile rides and riding on freight trains from one end of the country to the other in search of new opportunities. Alarmed at this growing surplus of idle youth, the Federal government set up the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, while the American Council on Education organized the American Youth Commission to study and make recommendations with respect to the solution of the problem.

Economic conditions gradually improved, but the

studies of the American Youth Commission indicated that the plight of great numbers of youth was unrelieved. About four million between the ages of 16 and 25 were out of school and out of work. This number constituted about one-third of all unemployed employables in the country, and indicated a rate of unemployment for the age range 16 to 25 about 20 per cent higher than that for any other age segment of the population. Further inquiry revealed that young people were the first to be laid off when employment decreased and the last to be given jobs when employment picked up. Related investigations pointed not only to the difficulty which young people had in obtaining jobs but also to the limited opportunities for training and advancement furnished by great numbers of the jobs which they did get.

The writer makes no pretense of knowing the true explanation for this sorry state of affairs but he does consider very important some of the factors associated with it: Because of shrinking markets, employers were compelled to reduce the costs of production; in many instances they resorted to labor-saving machinery; in many they suspended operations for the time being. As a result, unemployment increased. That diminished purchasing power, in turn reducing demand for the goods of the employer, who in self-defense was compelled to cut down the costs of production still further; and so on and on. At the same time a growing proportion of the population was entering the years of productive adulthood, intensifying the labor-market competition between youth and their elders in the labor market. For legal and other reasons, employers hesitated to employ anyone under the age of 18, while labor organizations restricted the number of new ad-

missions into their trades or crafts. The needs of older men and women with more work experience and more imperative personal obligations gained priority. The outcome of these trends was revealed in the increasing difficulty which the United States Employment Service had in selling the services of young people on their registry. For the most part youth had to wait until their elders were taken care of and were accommodated when something was left over for them to do.

In the meantime, surplus youth were piling up so rapidly that we were not prepared to provide adequate services for their care. Educators were making important advances in expanding the opportunities for greater numbers of young people to attend high school and colleges. Striking gains were also being made in the modification of the content and procedure of instruction in order to meet the needs of youth more effectively. But these changes had not been carried thoroughly and rapidly enough to solve the ominous problem that was arising in our midst. Non-governmental youth-serving agencies were augmenting the services of their programs, but they too were waging an uneven struggle. Churches, the Y.M.C.A., the Junior Farm Bureau, 4H Clubs and other similar groups were doing important work, but it was not enough. Of the young people between the ages of 16 and 25, 75 per cent were still outside organized groups. In other words, the prospect facing great numbers of youth was becoming desperate. Jobs were scarce and other forms of opportunity for the profitable use of their enforced leisure were restricted. A situation was arising in which many youth appeared to be locked out from the participation in the normal activities of the common life.

The preceding statement is of course a severe indictment of society. If in the minds of some it seems to

be exaggerated, we should remember that it is still only relative. To maintain balance in a delineation of the problem confronting *all* sections of youth, we must remind ourselves that of those between 16 and 25, 80 per cent either had jobs or were attending school. We must also remember that a larger proportion of youth were attending high school and college than ever before in our history. We must also celebrate the fact that no society in western civilization has been more concerned with the welfare of its children and youth than the present generation of adults in America. Such vehicles as the parent education movement, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the youth service committees of veterans organizations, of service and civic clubs and similar organizations have no parallel in any nation of the world. But after all this commendable effort is fully recorded, the fact remains that America's failure properly to assimilate its young people was beginning to reach tragic and scandalous dimensions. Analysis of the situation revealed that this failure affected certain groups of young people more than others. These groups were negro youth and young people from farms and from lower socio-economic classes in the cities. In view of the American ideal of equal opportunity, such a discrimination constituted a denial of our democratic traditions.

So far this discussion of the serious plight of American youth has been scrupulously confined to the past tense. For within the past year the program of national defense has been producing profound changes in our economy. Opportunities for employment have been expanding. While these opportunities have failed so far to reach large numbers of negro and rural youth, and others between the ages of 16 and 18, it is nevertheless true that the general improvement has begun

to open doors that were partly closed. An important part of the problem which existed prior to January 1, 1941, for the time being at least is relieved. In addition to increased employment, youth by the hundred thousands have been drawn into the armed forces to build up the defenses of the country. This fact too has had an obvious and direct influence upon the demand for youth in the labor market, and the demand will undoubtedly increase further.

We are now ready to bring the discussion to a focus. Without any malicious design on the part of any persons or agencies, or groups of persons or agencies, a state of affairs had arisen in which society up to a short time ago seemed to have no place for a very large proportion of its young people. Now, however, when we are in a state of national emergency, youth are suddenly needed to manufacture and to bear arms for the defense of the country. The irony of this change in a few months from a partly closed to a wide open door suggests implications beyond the scope of this discussion.

An important feature of the situation is that youth for the most part seem to be unaware of the meaning of this sudden reversal on the part of society. They do not appear as a group to be conscious of the limitations imposed on their status. If youth as individuals realized that their lot was difficult they rarely felt that it was any more serious than that confronting persons of other ages; and deep in the recesses of their incorrigible optimism they believed that the future would give them a chance.

As a result of the training by their elders, young people had moreover acquired a sincere revulsion at the prospect of war. At first they quietly resented the

military interruption of their efforts to establish a place for themselves in society; but now they are disposed to believe that they have the best physical equipment for military service. They are also, along with their elders, realizing the necessity for building up a formidable machine for the achievement of victory. But, to repeat, young people as a group are not conscious that society has switched from a disposition of partial rejection to one of eager acceptance within the span of a few months. And above all they are not aware of the implications of this fact. There are, of course, numerous exceptions; but this conclusion is substantially supported by various surveys of the attitudes of young people. And for the sake of the health and stability of society, it is perhaps fortunate that this is so. It gives society time to amend its tragic neglect and oversight.

If under extreme circumstances youth should take on a clear-cut group consciousness, or array itself solidly, it would probably be through the domination of some powerful clique of adults seeking national leadership. Or such fractioning might occur in a situation in which successive generations of youth were confronted with a prospect of growing hopelessness. The experience of Germany since the World War of 1914-18 would lead us to expect that a combination of these two factors is required. At the present time America fortunately seems to be in no serious danger of such a development.

On further thought, it is not difficult to understand why young people have failed to develop a consciousness of their status as a group. Like everyone else, young people are in a state of constant becoming. Whatever the chronological or developmental line separating them from childhood on the one hand and

adulthood on the other, they are continually advancing into stages of greater maturity. After the passage of a few years the older group have moved into the role of adulthood, and the younger group have moved into the position of their departing seniors, while a new quota have marched up from childhood to become the juniors of the new seniors. This process is a stream and is going on all the time. To speak of youth, therefore, as a fixed unchanging group is unrealistic and illusory.

Another factor preventing the differentiation of youth as a group is the cohesiveness of family life. In spite of discouraging appearances to the contrary, the home plays a powerful role in our society. And in spite of the tendency for young people to assert their independence, a strong loyalty links these young people with their parents. Moreover, in spite of our recent economic dislocations, it must not be forgotten that America has established a strong belief in the ideal of equal opportunity. There are strong forces binding youth to the main trunk of American society.

In any case, for the present and until victory is won there will be ample room for youth. The current crisis both nationally and internationally differs from former crises in that it involves *all* sections of society; but even in these days of total conflict, young people are still the prize resource of the nation. They are the vanguard of defense. Their bodies can deliver and take punishment, and their segregation into regiments and squadrons is of all ages the least disrupting to the normal life of society. Youth have always been and will always be in great demand when war threatens.

But what lies ahead in the days of reconstruction? No

one can prophesy with accuracy, at best we can only suggest the outlines of possible trends. What happens to youth is bound up with what will happen to all. Speculation about the period following the emergency falls into two categories, one pessimistic and the other optimistic.

The pessimistic view maintains that we will be confronted with a debt so huge that the losses and privations of the early thirties will be but as a drop in the ocean in comparison with the distress and destitution that will settle down over the country. If this forecast is correct, we have every reason to believe that youth will occupy the same status in the new depression that it occupied in the old. This time it will be worse. It will be worse for many reasons, but we may cite here only two. If the young men returning from military service are given priority in employment, the new generation of youth, who are just coming of age, will be shut out by this inevitable competition. On the other hand, if the ex-service men along with their younger brothers and sisters* are shut out of the jobs taken over in their absence by new machinery and older workers, society will be confronted by a youth problem much more serious than any we have heretofore known.

In contrast, the optimistic view counts on two factors not only to prevent the much-feared depression, but to bring us to the threshold of a new era of abundance. Before peace returns a large part of our productive capacity will be devoted to military purposes. This effort will require an increase in the total productive capacity of the country and also a heavy diversion of pro-

* The 1940 census indicates that there are approximately 12,500,000 youth in the United States between the ages of 15 and 19—a number greater than that in any other five-year period in the entire age range of the population.

duction from non-military needs. The nation's unsatisfied needs will create a tremendous consumer demand which will enable us to shift from a wartime to a peacetime economy without collapse. But more important, the emergency will have increased the productive personnel and equipment of the country beyond anything we have ever known and will have pointed the way to the development of an expanding economy which from early history has been the dominant motif of American life.

The young men now going into the army, and those other young men and the young women who are called upon to make the utmost effort in the various supporting services, are going to carry an increasing share of the total burden of this total war. And unless they discover—after waiting so long to be called in on the nation's business—that this is truly their war, they cannot be expected to carry it through to victory. But they can come to feel that this is their war if they see the entire nation striving toward a way of life that makes a place for them, for the families they want to establish, for the homes they want to make their own.

Moreover, the young people, and older ones, too, must not be intimidated by anybody's fear of the "huge debts." Of course there will be huge debts after the war; but it is just as well to be clear about what they mean, especially for the youth on the way out and for the families they leave or will come back to. Certainly we shall have exhausted vast portions of the physical reserves that had been accumulated in advance and that are not being used up privately as "consumer goods." And we shall be drawing upon all the surplus production that might otherwise be diverted to private uses. More than that, however, these huge "debts" will in-

clude the privations and deficiencies of men, women, and children who manage, in spite of their losses and mutilations, to live on. Most of these personal and organic and spiritual "debts" will of course never be paid in any sense. And if we plan to "repay" all those other debts, we shall do so only by continuing indefinitely to deprive, not one-third but nine-tenths of the nation, of adequate food, decent housing, suitable clothing, and the enjoyment of life. That is to say, we should win the war for the privilege of continuing to do as we have always done, but on a larger scale of suffering and degradation.

When the old reserves have been shot into nothingness or sunk without trace, from whom will we "borrow" to owe those prospective debts? Does any group of our fellows now own those billions we are going to spend, do the concrete things those billions represent even exist in any sense? They are still to be produced—by the nation at war. Here as in England, and in all the nations at war, the fighting will be carried on by what we are able continuously to produce through the day-by-day work of men and women and youth—and children too, very often. It will be through that day-by-day work that we will keep ourselves alive and supply the materials and munitions. That is why youth counts today, why the decisions of "labor" suddenly become momentous, why we find ourselves suddenly able to get along with fewer flunkys.

As the young fellows willing to be soldiers and sailors and aviators, and the men and women attached to those precious skilled "hands" get the notion that this is *their* war, as they discover their importance as persons, they may conclude that the huge debts are really owing to them. For they are the people whose efforts will have

won the victory. With that attitude, no debt can loom so large and formidable as to paralyze their will.

Before the emergency, people of all political parties and all levels of society were becoming more and more disturbed by the incongruity between the poverty of great sections of our people on the one hand, and the curtailment of production on the other. Now the mobilization of productive power necessitated by the war makes this contradiction even more difficult to understand—or to accept. In the face of the resources that the nation will know that it commands, there will be a growing tide of insistence that if we can mobilize for war, we can and must mobilize for peace. In such a mobilization, people of all ages will have a stake, but the stake of youth will be the greatest because they will have the most to gain and the least to lose.

Youth are dynamic and on the side of growth. Stasis and decline are foreign to their mood. Hence they are not only interested in the war as a means of maintaining our democracy, but they are even more interested in the war as an opportunity to achieve the completer democracy that is yet to be. We need their hope for the greater peace even more than we need their bodies and skill for military operations. But so long as society requires youth to prepare itself, if necessary, for the ultimate sacrifice, it is morally bound to create conditions whereby their needs are matched by opportunity.

Studies made by the American Youth Commission showed that at the beginning of the year 1941 there were still nearly four million young men and women out of school, in need of jobs, and totally unemployed. Other millions are in part-time jobs or marking time in schools or on the farm. "For these young people," the Commission had concluded, "the fundamental condi-

tions of real freedom do not exist. We have taken away liberty by allowing conditions to exist that deny liberty. We cannot say that these young people are to achieve life and liberty only by struggling successfully as individuals from a morass for which we are all economically, politically, and morally responsible. . . . While the nation has taken some admirable steps toward these ends, the steps have been far from adequate." . . . "The Commission is not under the illusion" that adequate steps can be taken "apart from heavy costs and perhaps some grave risks, but it is convinced that these costs should be resolutely borne, that risks should be taken, and that all doubt regarding the acceptance of these costs and these risks should be unequivocally removed on the day when the compulsory military service measure is passed."

Eighteen months after this statement was published, the nation was at war. During the intervening time, everybody's attention had been so closely fixed upon the foreign developments and their threat to our country's interests, that youth as well as many other underprivileged groups were just allowed to wait. Whatever improvements have taken place in employment and in the social recognition of these millions were incidental to our defense program and the national emergency rather than deliberate fulfillments of our conscious purpose.

Nobody knows how long the war will last. We may be sure that it will be destructive of life and material treasure. It will furnish preoccupation to youth and it will no doubt overwork many of us. It will not of itself, however, solve the problems which the emergency has taken out of our hands. Those problems will return to plague us unless we manage somehow, while carrying our fight forward with our fullest powers, to keep con-

stantly in mind what it is we are fighting for. We may find useful many of the old slogans; but it will not do to refer constantly to "the American way of life" without attempting systematically to give that phrase concrete meaning for the boys and girls who are to continue this nation when the fighting is over. They will not be content to resume on a plateau or on a decline.

We cannot in practice discriminate between those younger men who get into direct military activities, and those others whose services are in various industrial or technical fields. In a total war all the services are essential, or they cannot be maintained. Nor can we discriminate between the young men and the women: All are part of the civilization we are trying to save and to further. It becomes necessary, accordingly, in time of war, to develop not alone the recreational and social activities which we recognize as essential for morale, not alone the health and welfare activities that we recognize as essential for carrying on the vital war work; not alone those educational activities that are necessary for training the civilian and the military workers. It is necessary to develop those subtler processes which determine the attitudes and values and relationships which make up the democracy we have mentioned so often. And that includes basically the cultivation of the attitudes and relationships that are distinctive of the family.

Significant for the present outlook is The American Youth Commission's statement of July 1940:

. . . democracy will not be aided and the salvation of this country will not be advanced, by the conscription of life that is underprivileged and unhopeful. This country can only be defended enthusiastically by people who expect just treatment from it. . . . We must face the realities of our situation, but we must face all the realities, including the very pressing question as to whether

democracy is willing to be sincere about its own purposes to the extent of carrying out the things for which democracy stands. . . . The hope and faith of our own young people are in danger precisely at the time when the nation stands in greatest need of that hope and that faith. It is therefore the considered opinion of this Commission that if as a people we are to adopt a measure providing for compulsory military training and service, we should at the same time bring to an end all partial and hesitant handling of the immediate needs of youth within the civilian population, we should demonstrate that we are capable of moving as boldly and effectively to meet one set of needs as the other, by taking steps which leave no doubt of the national will and the national resourcefulness.

APPENDICES

-

STAFF OF THE CHILD STUDY
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG, *Director*

BERNARD GLUECK, M.D., *Director, Family Guidance
and Consultation Service*

ANNA W. M. WOLF, *Senior Staff Member*

CAROLINE B. ZACHRY, *Consultant*

PETER BLOS, *Consultant*

BENJAMIN SPOCK, M.D., *Consultant*

ALINE B. AUERBACH, *Educational Associate*

PAULINE RUSH FADIMAN, *Editor*

JOSETTE FRANK, *Editor*

HELEN G. STERNAU, *Editorial Associate*

-

CHILDREN IN WARTIME: PARENTS' QUESTIONS

by

The Staff of the Child Study Association of America

WHEN war strikes, parents' thoughts turn at once to their children. No matter how wide or unselfish our sympathies, it is perfectly natural that the first pang should be for the welfare of our own. If we have a son of fighting age we must offer him all our courage and our deep faith to support his own. But if our children are younger there are measures to consider, not for their safety alone but also for their emotional well-being.

The attitude of parents as expressed daily in home life counts immediately and counts deeply. There are things we have already learned from England about children in wartime, and the most important is that so far as their morale is concerned, it is the *parents who determine the mood*. In the last analysis it is the tone in our millions of homes that will determine the tone of the nation. This means that parents in these perilous times feel a deep and special responsibility.

Whatever morale means, it means something more than a "front." It means more than grim silence or a pretense of courage. For families, it means a frank but balanced recognition of a common danger, and a feeling of confidence that, come what may, its members will stand by one another.

We have long known how foolish it is to try to deceive children. If a surgical operation has to be faced, telling a child that "it won't hurt a bit" is not the best way to help him through it. On the contrary, we tell him—briefly, to be sure—that it probably will hurt some, but that his mother will be right beside him. We know too that it is not our words that convince, but rather the child's feeling that his parents have matters under

control, that they know just what has to be done and can do it. The same is true even of serious disaster. When death comes to a family and grief seems for a time to overwhelm and destroy everything, the child who finds that his parents do, after all, go on again with life and living, nearly always finds that he can, too.

If parents are to keep their own balance it is important that their demands on themselves should not be superhuman. We *are* anxious—even fearful; and we are likely to be more so. There will be many times when we are tired and will feel and show the strain. We can't be models of absolute self-control, industry and self-sacrifice. We can, however, comfort ourselves with the knowledge that such occasional breakdowns or signs of discouragement do no real damage. If the underlying loyalty is there the whole family will be sure to sense it and will find strength in it.

This was sharply brought out in the replies of many children evacuated from London during the period of severest air raids, when questioned about their homesickness. What they most remembered was "my older brother teasing me," "my father growling about who took his newspaper." Evidently it is such familiar commonplaces that spell home to us all and when we are most tried these are the things that stay with us.

British experiences show us, too, that among children the worst emotional upsets are likely to appear in the preschool and in the teen ages. This bears out what we have always known—that even in normal times it is the very early and the adolescent years that are the periods of childhood's greatest inner conflict. For children under seven the inability to grasp this large and threatening situation—to understand it or do anything about it—only increases the feeling of uncertainty that goes with being little. The recent rise in delinquency in Britain among children in the younger adolescent group also probably comes from feeling useless. Young people always have a great need to do things, and when there is so much that needs to be done, ways should and must be found for making these older children feel that they are useful members of the larger group working to win the war.

Many questions will be asked by parents, not all of which can be answered in advance, or perhaps at all. New and unpredictable situations will arise. Almost immediately upon the declaration of war, questions began to come to the Child Study Association. The staff at once started to organize whatever suggestions it could make, and published a pamphlet early in January. This material is reprinted here in the hope that it will continue to be helpful to parents and children in the crisis.

BABIES NEED NOT BE FRIGHTENED

My two-year-old is easily frightened by loud noises. How can I help him in these days? Sirens and low-flying planes have terrified him already and I dread to think of the effect on him of the air raid siren which is being installed not far from our home, and of worse noises which may follow.

Most babies are frightened by *sudden noise*—some more than others—but they can get used to a surprising amount of racket of many kinds and learn to ignore it. This takes time. Fortunately these young babies have no idea of the meaning of these military noises. Children in London have learned to draw the covers over their ears and many of them have slept through bombings quite peacefully. Unless they sense our own feelings of threat through our tense nerves and muscles, we can probably help the babies to accept the new kinds of racket in much the same way that we help them to live through thunderstorms or to sleep through the noise of elevated trains. Stay close to your child during unusual noises; let him feel your protecting body comfort. Playing a kind of game about it may help to relax both parent and child. Imitating an airplane or making other noises and translating into action the things of which he is scared may prove helpful.

If you happen to live where bomb shelters may have to be used, desert island games and special picnic parties held in the shelters from time to time may help to give these places an everyday feeling. This will make them less threatening to little children in case of real emergency. But don't be disturbed

if some anxiety lingers on for a while. Your reassuring presence will do more than anything else to quiet him and eventually he is likely to get used to all kinds of noises.

CAUTION OR FEAR

How can parents avoid frightening their children and yet get them to take the necessary precautions for safety in case of air raids? My children walk long distances to school every day and ought to know about signals and what to do. I am afraid that giving them information will only frighten them more.

It is not what or how much you tell your children that frightens them, but how you tell it. Let your manner be sensible and matter-of-fact. Of course you should give your children complete instructions, as these come from official sources. Then explain to them the reasons behind these instructions. Make what you have to say simple and brief. Don't go into a dozen or so remote possibilities. Don't repeat yourself, or beg your children to listen so as to be sure to understand what you are saying. They get you the first time. After you have told them, go about your business and let them go about theirs. Your composure and ability to attend to all the familiar routines will calm them more than any number of sermons on being calm. Fear in children comes not nearly so much from knowing the facts about possible dangers and how to meet them, as from a "hush hush" atmosphere, or from feeling that their own parents are jittery and that there is something that is being hidden from them.

BEFORE THEY UNDERSTAND

How much can my four-year-old understand about the war? And how can I keep him from hearing all sorts of frightening things from his older brother and his brother's friends and even from some grownups? Every once in a while when he sees me looking troubled he says, "Haven't they caught Hitler yet?"

It is true that little children cannot understand what the war

is about. They have no clear idea whether the fighting is near or far away or what it is like or what it all means. They are likely to catch only a mood of terror. Therefore "business as usual" and all the reassuring details and pleasures of their own small lives are the best thing for them. Young children will be better off if they don't hear constant war talk. But neither should we try to avoid the subject altogether. Perhaps you can put it up to your seven-year-old that he, and his friends too, have a real "war job" right now in seeing that the younger ones don't get scared. That will mean watching their step with radio and conversations and seeing that others do too.

Yet we cannot completely protect even the young child from knowing that there is a war and that there is danger. In addition to thoughtless and idle talk there are likely also to be grim realities, and every family must take precautions. We can't pretend the war isn't here, and we will have to meet our children's questions whenever they come and at whatever age. The attitude which seems to say "don't bother your little head about such things" always defeats its purpose. Not only does this attitude give the child a feeling that he is not being told about something threatening, which makes it twice as frightening, but it also cuts him off from the comfort of being in on the whole thing with his parents. Even a small child who is puzzled and anxious may get a great relief from occasional direct and open talk about the war.

JUST BRING TOGETHER HELPS

Isn't there a danger in our overdoing the stoical act at this time? Why pretend that nothing unusual is happening? When times are special aren't people's needs special too?

Of course you are right. Going about grimly pretending that life moves on in the same old way may not be the best thing for either parents or children. There is a kind of bravado which some people assume at this time which is emotionally unhealthy not only for themselves but also for the people who look to them for understanding and support. While going about our business quietly, let us remember, too, that we need both to

find extra strength and to give it. Just being together is one enormous strengthener: let's not get so busy, even with war work, that we overlook the emotional needs of our own families. Most of us now feel the need for more evenings at home—we instinctively crave companionship with those who are closest. Even when we do and say commonplace things we get lots of comfort from just feeling that, come what may, we'll at least see it through together.

If you can't be with your family as much as you'd like, a thoughtful phone call now and then may help to bring that necessary sense that you're thinking of each other anyway. If you're going to be out of reach at times, have a standing arrangement with your children as to how they may get in touch with a neighbor or family friend in case of emergency, or even if there is no emergency, when they just feel the need of home-like support.

WHISTLING TO KEEP UP YOUR COURAGE

My boy of ten seems almost angrily indifferent to the war. He is impatient with our conversations and constant listening to news reports. Apparently all the instructions given him at school irritate him. He insists there is no danger and that people who think there is are just silly. How can I make him more aware of the seriousness of what is going on?

Don't be fooled. Whistling to keep up your courage is a well-known device. Maybe for this particular boy it is a necessary kind of refuge—each must find his own way. Probably behind all this belligerent indifference there is more anxiety than appears. Don't try to force a more realistic attitude upon him. He probably knows as well as you do what is going on. Maybe some day you'll find a chance to help him admit to more anxiety than he now shows. His discovery that it isn't "sissy" to admit his fears will be a healthy one.

Children manage their fears by different means, and react to danger in a variety of unpredictable ways. Don't be surprised at anything. The child who seems altogether indifferent may

be the very one who will show his concealed anxiety in ways that are apparently unrelated. This is true of children, not only in wartime, but in any situation in which they can't admit their *real feelings*. Our experience with young children teaches us that they find ways of masking their feelings. For example, the unacknowledged jealousy of an older child toward a new baby may show itself in recurrences of bed-wetting, thumb sucking, disobedience and other misbehavior even while he apparently "loves" the baby. Similarly the child with whom war anxiety is largely unconscious and who shows only indifference may now take to bullying the younger child—to demanding extra attention from his parents, or to expressing his hidden fears, in many other indirect ways. Such misbehavior, while it lasts, will call for patience and understanding from both father and mother. In time, these children are likely to get their second wind and quiet down.

THE BOY WHO IS THRILLED WITH THE WAR

My eleven-year-old son seems delighted at the war. His walls are full of maps; he gets the news eagerly. He and his friends talk constantly about going out and "blasting" Hitler. "Just my luck," he says, "to live where there's no fighting. Boy! Would I love to have an air raid!" I find it hard to believe he is really so bloodthirsty. Is there anything I ought to do about it?

Remember that there is invariably a thrill at the thought of real danger. It would be less than human not to be excited and stimulated. In many children the love of adventure is very strong and quite natural and is not as "bloodthirsty" as it seems. The sight of the aggressive primitive male animal, when he happens to be our own son, is likely to shock his mother, though rarely his father. But your son is not abnormal, and the kinds of feeling he is expressing are for very many—both younger and older—certainly natural right now.

RADIO LISTENING—IS IT TOO EXCITING?

What about the radio? Aren't we all overdoing it? Wouldn't it be better for the children *not* to listen so

continuously? Along with the terribly exciting and often distressing war news, they are also getting the exciting dramatic programs. It all adds up to a pretty heavy diet of excitement. Yet the children seem to be drawn to it like moths to the flame.

Children are well aware of exciting things happening in the world around them, and radio offers one way for them to take part in these happenings vicariously. One of our greatest problems is to help children feel that they have a share in all this, that they play a part in it. The radio, addressing as it does each listener directly, makes the children part of the great world outside. There *are* limits, of course; and a steady, non-stop stream of continuous radio should be avoided. In fact, the children themselves often turn off the radio when they have had enough. Children and adults too can be appealed to for some moderation in this respect on a basis of common sense and household peace.

It is undesirable, moreover, for children to have so much excitement aroused with too little chance to drain it off in action. Adults must help to provide the antidote by seeing that the children have plenty of active things to do and that other interests are not crowded out entirely.

PLAYING AT WAR

The boys on our block play nothing but war these days. Their belts fairly bristle with toy guns and makeshift war planes are constantly zooming through the air. Isn't the world full enough of this sort of thing without the children having to play at it? How can we stop it?

Don't try to stop this kind of war play. Play is the language of children, their way of working out the matters that concern them deeply at the moment. Boys have always played games that gave release to their warlike feelings. Cops and robbers, Indian and cowboy, Lone Ranger, Superman, or war games have much the same root and much the same meaning for the players.

A certain amount of such play is needed by most normal young males at any time. Their need is even greater today when

war surges all about them. Girls too feel this need now. They have to play out their heightened feelings, just as many of us older people need to talk ours out.

Up to a certain point this is perfectly healthy—a real safety valve. You will probably find that the excitement dies down somewhat as time goes on. If not, some adult help may be needed toward finding other, less exciting substitutes, especially athletic games, dramatics, and other more peaceful or “symbolic” expressions of rivalry and struggle.

LEARNING TO OBEY

The air-raid warden in our apartment house has issued some directions which I question. And I am troubled too about some of the emergency regulations in force at my child's school. Must I see that my family obeys these rules when I really doubt their wisdom?

If each one of us attempts to make his own rules, serious confusion and danger to the whole community will inevitably result. In an emergency some official plan, by which everyone is guided, is of utmost importance. If you are not satisfied that the present rules are the best possible, it is your democratic privilege, as well as your obligation, to make suggestions for their improvement to the responsible authorities. But whether or not your suggestions are accepted, it is imperative that you obey and teach your children to obey. Conforming to the regulations is essential for the common safety. Having such regulations for our welfare made by our own representatives is of the essence of democracy. Our way of meeting the emergency is a test of democratic morale.

Most of us have lived in a world which made few demands on us for strict obedience and many of us have brought up our children under a system of discipline in which obedience played a minor role. It takes some readjusting for us to accept authority so unquestioningly now, and to help our children to do the same. This doesn't mean that our way was the wrong way. On the contrary, our kind of discipline is needed to create free people for a free society. But the present situation is a test of

our *adaptability*. To no small degree our own readiness and willingness to make this adjustment will determine the ease with which our children do their part.

MOTHER'S WORK

How about the morale of mothers right now? If children depend so largely on mothers, what can be done to keep them from feeling useless and therefore discouraged?

The trouble with much of woman's work is that a great part of it—housework—is a lonely business. Now, of all times, we crave companionship with our own kind. Women have always found relief in keeping their hands busy with knitting and sewing and in the knowledge that this work brings comfort to the men who are fighting, or to children who need clothing. There is a particular satisfaction in doing this, or any other work for which they find themselves suited, *in groups*. Through the Civilian Defense offices, the local Red Cross and the women's voluntary organizations most of us can find some group work into which our particular abilities—the things we can do best—will fit. New needs will be arising all the time, such as special help in the schools, in the church, through parents' associations, or in the local community.

It cannot be said too often that now is the time of all times when people of all ages need to herd together and to work not only *for* their fellow men but *with* them.

ON BEING AFRAID

I am a somewhat nervous person even in normal times. Now everybody is telling us parents to keep calm. How can *anybody* be calm under these circumstances? I do my best to *appear* calm, but I am sure that my real feelings get through to my children. What can I do about it?

Don't try to be superhuman. Of course we are all more or less alarmed. Who wouldn't be? No use pretending that there just isn't a thing to worry about. But legitimate fear need not be allowed to become jitters. Let your children know that every normal person has certain dangers to face, and that it's natural to be on guard against them. Nobody really intends

that parents should deny either the dangers or the fears. But emphasize the steps that are being taken to avert or to meet these dangers. Of course if you're going to turn pale and stop everything you're doing whenever an airplane passes overhead, you are going to communicate your state of mind to the children. But having acknowledged the realities, your children will be grateful to you for going on with your usual activities and keeping your home as normal as possible. There is something very reassuring and stabilizing in the carrying out of the usual routines.

WOMEN AND THE HOME FRONT

Is it the duty of every woman to find war or community work outside her home? Is she not serving her country just as faithfully if she attends to her own home, husband and children?

Certainly her own family in nearly every case is a mother's first responsibility. It seems a little foolish for women to rush around looking for war work which may not yet exist and overlook their children's anxieties or other problems. The young mother with several small children can perhaps do no better than to give them all she has. Even in wartime there is no more important job than seeing that our homes are real havens of peace, warmth and safety. Yet when we have done our best for our own, there are plenty of women who find that there is still time over, and who today feel as never before the urge to serve not only their own homes but the larger community too. Each woman will have to decide for herself whether she has energies to spare. There are times when a woman is a better mother for doing work outside as well as inside her home, and times when she is not.

SCHOOLING OR SERVICE—WHICH?

What can we say to our children who cannot see the sense of going to school or college right now? Even the boys and girls of high school age are impatient about school and insist that they want to *do* something about the war.

Their feeling is natural. We all want to do something about it and wish we knew what. Yet very many of all ages can make

their best contribution by going on with their regular work. Many young people should be encouraged to serve directly. Others of high school or even college age will, for the present at least, serve their country best by continuing and in some cases intensifying their school work. Parents and teachers can rightfully point out to them how great the need will be for a generation trained and equipped to make a good peace and to rebuild a shattered world. School people have already begun to see that their work cannot go on as if nothing unusual were happening. Studies of many kinds will have to be redirected so that school work will be more meaningful to youth in a world at war.

Yet we must expect these boys and girls to be restless and to demand some immediate part in the war effort. The best thought of our various youth organizations—Scouts, Y's, Boys' Clubs, Campfire Girls etc.—should be given to finding ways of directing into useful community work the young people's energies and enthusiasms and capacity for high devotion. And parents and teachers should do their best to encourage the boys and girls to join in such projects.

For the young people in college—especially the boys of military age—the problem may be even more difficult. We can tell them how great will be the country's need for educated men in the days to come. But to many boys its present need for soldiers will seem more urgent. Combining study and military training in the R.O.T.C. will be a satisfactory compromise for many. To others immediate enlistment will seem the only course. Each must make his decision in accordance with his own conscience. For many the choice will be a difficult one. As parents we have not the right to interfere or to burden them further with doubts and reproaches. We have to recognize, too, that for many the opportunity to do war work is a welcome liberation from an otherwise meaningless or disagreeable program.

THE OVERANXIOUS CHILD

In spite of all my efforts to "keep calm" (I am not a nervous person), my five-year-old daughter has been terrified ever since war was declared. Even before we went in she

asked anxiously if every airplane she heard might not drop bombs. Now she has dreams and night terrors that her baby brother has been killed, that the enemy are coming right into the house. I have forbidden all war discussion, news broadcasts, etc. in her presence but it hasn't helped much. I am afraid that this will leave a permanent impression and upset her nerves for life. Is there anything I can do?

All the testimony of the British psychiatrists and others who have worked with children during the war shows that, like adults, children who are emotionally satisfied and generally well-balanced to begin with stand up well under enormous strain and recover even from what we might consider shattering experiences. Your saying that your child was afraid even before the war started raises the possibility that like many children from the age of two to six or seven, she has had some tendency to fears already. Her present state may be *intensified* by knowledge of real dangers, by hearing news bulletins and reports, but it is not *caused* by these things.

When children are continuously afraid of bombs that *might* come, in terror for the safety of a father who is unlikely to be called, for a baby brother peacefully asleep in his crib, then we must realize that just as children fear giants or wild animals in peacetime, these are not the things which are really frightening them, but are only the symbols with which the real cause has been masked. The real causes are not in the outside world but lie within your child herself. Essentially she is afraid of certain of her own impulses and instincts which she has somehow learned to regard as "bad." She may be afraid, for example, because beneath the surface, she hates the baby, or is jealous of her father, or feels that some of her sex thoughts or acts are "forbidden." Bottling these things up tight within herself—so tight that she no longer knows they are there—she cannot shake off the feeling that punishment must surely follow; she sees it lurking all about her and uses "the war" or other current experiences merely to give it body or justification. Far too briefly and simply stated,

this is the psychology of much of the exaggerated anxiety of those people who are forever dying a thousand deaths.

You may help your child by trying to improve all her relationships to members of the family and to outsiders, by raising her self-esteem in every way possible, and by allowing her angry feelings and her natural sex curiosity some expression. Children like these, if their parents will try to be especially reassuring and loving, usually grow out of this phase, and as their general morale improves their "war fears" tend to diminish. Meanwhile, such a child should not of course be subjected to constant reminders of danger, if we can prevent it. But it is important not to stop with such purely negative measures since the real causes lie elsewhere.

If, in spite of all you can do, the child's fears get worse instead of better, it might be well for you to get advice from professional sources.

MUST WE TEACH CHILDREN TO HATE?

Until recent events forced us into a horrible dilemma, my husband and I believed and taught our children that hate and war were the most destructive forces on earth. We taught them also to respect and believe in the reasonableness of human beings of all races and nationalities. Now there is an orgy of hate let loose. I believe my older children can keep their balance, but I dread the effect on the little ones. Must even the babies hate?

A few days before war broke out one of our radio news analysts said something like this: "I am going to say what within a week may be considered treasonous. I am going to say that in spite of all that has happened, Japanese are still human beings—Germans are still human beings. If Americans forget this, even though they win the war, they are in danger of losing the peace."

These are wise words, too wise perhaps for children to understand. But if parents believe them they cannot help making their attitude count with their children, even while they wholeheartedly give their full support to this war. Of course there

are countless decent Germans and decent Japanese, and even many millions more who are just helpless and bewildered. But if we have brought up our children to believe that *all* people can be counted on to be just and reasonable, we have certainly deceived them and need to revise our teaching. Even the youngest child can be told that there are certainly dangerous people in the world, and when these get to be heads of government, they kill and rob people to get what they want. If their own citizens don't stop them, the time comes when others must do so. That means war.

Perhaps this is too detached a view for people who have lost and suffered through the evil doings of others; it is only one possible attitude. Each of us will have to find where he stands. Meanwhile, perhaps, the best thing we can do is to help our children to be fair to others of enemy alien descent with whom they come in contact and who are certainly not responsible for this war. If they really love justice they will not tolerate ostracizing the classmate whose parents come from Germany, or ridiculing Japanese children in their community, or stealing fruit from the corner grocer whose name and accent are Italian. Feeling as we do, we must oppose these things even though in wartime they may be "natural." If we can keep a spirit of justice and kindness alive in this practical sense we probably need not fear permanent injury to our children's characters. If your children are emotionally sound, well-balanced personalities, all the wartime propaganda that they will run across in movies, radio, comics and elsewhere will probably leave them essentially unharmed.

Remember too that there is a real distinction between an unhealthy and destructive type of hatred and the righteous indignation that a normal person feels toward cruelty and injustice. There are some kinds of action that should *not* be tolerated and that we are glad to see our children hotly resent. It is well for them to hate the oppression of weaker nations by stronger ones, to hate the suppressors of freedom, to hate race and religious persecutions. When they see in such persons as Hitler and Mussolini the very embodiment of cruelty, they can

hardly help hating them too—for these are today the flesh and blood symbols of all that is detestable in men, all that stands in the way of decent human living. There are some things worse than war, worse than bloodshed. These are slavery and degradation. Let us not be afraid to say so.

-

This material was prepared for the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, by Frederick H. Allen, M.D., Director, Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic; Mildred C. Scoville, Executive Assistant, Commonwealth Fund; George S. Stevenson, M.D., Medical Director, National Committee for Mental Hygiene; Douglas A. Thom, M.D., Director, Habit Clinic for Child Guidance, Boston; Caroline B. Zachry, Ph.D., Director, Institute on Personality Development of the Progressive Education Association.

TO PARENTS IN WARTIME

The first line of defense is the home!

As ARMIES march, planes fly, ships sail, and factories hum with the tremendous effort of total war, the security, the protection, and the morale of the families at home are fundamental to success. Our children are as much a concern of our government in this emergency as are the soldiers and munitions workers who carry on the war directly. Nowhere in the world have children held the place of prime importance in the scheme of living and in the thoughts and consideration of adults as in the United States. Nowhere is there a body of more conscientious parents earnestly and eagerly trying to provide the most intelligent care for the physical and mental health and development of their children.

PARENTS SHOULD PREPARE FOR DEFENSE

When war was declared, parents all over the United States had the same immediate reaction. Through their minds flashed the images of their children wherever they were and whatever they were doing, with the accompanying thoughts: Are they

safe? What must we do to protect them? How can we help them through the war days to come?

Newspapers, schools, clinics, teachers, and doctors were beset by inquiries about how parents should handle this emergency with respect to their children—an eloquent proof that our boast about our American parenthood is justified. Parents want to meet this new challenge as they have met the other less spectacular ones in the past, with courage and wisdom.

The question they want answered is—How?

Two principal suggestions to parents are the result of real agreement in all the answers made to this question. They are perhaps disappointing in their undramatic firmness, but they both require a great deal of thought and effort.

1. Prepare yourselves to face whatever may come.
2. Help your children to continue living their everyday lives with as little change as possible.

THE FIRST SUGGESTION:

PREPARE YOURSELVES TO FACE WHATEVER MAY COME

Your children can take it if you can.

Frankly, every parent is anxious. Every intelligent adult must recognize the dangers, the upsets, and the changes involved in the total war we are all embarked upon. Parents must, with the help of the community, appraise the real situation in which they specifically live. So how are parents to behave even though anxious about their children?

INTELLIGENT FEAR CAN BE HELPFUL

The dangers and risks that parents may have to face produce an actual fear that might better be admitted to themselves to start with. But there is a vast difference between an intelligent facing of a difficult or even dangerous situation and an anxious and destructive dread of an unprepared-for blow.

CHILDREN SENSE THE FEELINGS OF THOSE THEY LOVE

Children, far more than adults realize, sense the underlying thoughts and feelings of those they love. What parents think

and feel about a situation has far more effect than anything they may say. Therefore it is wiser to be honest with your children and to command their respect by talking to a certain extent and quite normally about the danger of air raids and fires and the possibility of separations in the family when such dangers and possibilities actually exist.

CALL THINGS BY THEIR RIGHT NAMES

Above all, don't suppress or banish from family conversation all reference to war. It is a topic your children will certainly hear discussed everywhere else. Children can bear reality much better than the uncertainty created by a mystery. A specific suggestion on this point may be helpful: Use the same words that are heard constantly in school, on the street, and over the radio. Don't make up pretty names to soften the meaning of terms like "blackout," "alarms," "explosions," and the like. If an air-raid drill is planned at home, don't call it "a sort of fire drill." Fear of words communicates fear of the situation itself to the sensitive imagination of a child.

APPRAISE DANGERS FRANKLY

It is always best for the child to hear of possible dangers from those he loves most. It is best for him to realize very early that those he trusts are preparing to face emergencies with him. This frank appraisal of dangers where they actually exist is an important step toward the sort of behavior that parents want to achieve even though they cannot escape their anxiety for their children.

WHEN WE ARE BUSY WE HAVE LITTLE TIME TO WORRY

The next step follows from the fact that dependence of someone else on us for calm and strength often helps us to behave as though we really had both. And behaving as though we were calm for the sake of others finally produces a degree of real calm. With reasonable conviction and courage we can try to understand what is ahead of us and what we should do about it. We must satisfy ourselves that we have taken every reasonable precaution. Then, the busier we are with those things

that really need to be done, the less time we shall have to indulge ourselves in useless worries about things that may never happen anyway.

ANXIETY

Anxiety is normal, natural, useful. It is a signal that awakens and prepares the individual to meet impending danger. This state of mind that we call ANXIETY is characterized by alertness, awareness, and fear appropriate to the situation that creates the anxiety. Increased blood supply and oxygen provide the fuel for additional bodily activity and, in association with increased muscular tone and acuteness of sight and hearing, represent a sort of "getting up steam" process that anticipates and prepares for action.

ANXIETY IS A NATURAL EMOTION

Anxiety is closely associated with the instinct for self-preservation, and its function is that of protecting the individual by making him aware and ready to meet a crisis. Anxiety is not something to be ashamed of. Like grief, anger, and joy, it is a normal emotional response to a life situation and should be looked upon as having a perfectly normal background and a useful function.

THE CHRONIC WORRIER CONTRIBUTES LITTLE

There are those individuals, however, who seem to be in a state of continuous anxiety. They are the worriers of the world. They seem to suffer from constant anticipation of the worst, and consequently they are susceptible to anything that tends to increase their ever-present sense of insecurity. Such individuals are extremely sensitive to gossip and rumor, and in their effort to be reassured they spread their pessimistic tales from one person to another, and usually the tales become more and more gloomy the more frequently they are told. Truly it may be said that they are the type who see the hole but never the doughnut. These individuals, whether they be parents, teachers, or other adults to whom children would naturally turn in time

of danger, will have nothing to contribute but a reflection of their own sense of insecurity.

CHILDREN OFTEN WORRY BECAUSE THOSE AROUND THEM WORRY

Children who have the misfortune to have been brought up in an environment dominated by such individuals, not infrequently take on a similar pattern of thinking and acting; and such children well may be in need of special consideration in time of crisis. It will be important and helpful for these children to be in a group with others who entertain a more normal, healthier outlook and are able to participate in the occupations and diversions that may be created for just such emergencies.

EACH CHILD'S TEMPERAMENT IS DIFFERENT

We must keep in mind also that the temperaments and dispositions of children vary markedly in the same families and that something deeper and more fundamental than environmental influences may be the cause of their timidity and anxiety. In their efforts to allay undue fears, parents should try to evaluate the particular needs of each child.

ONE CHILD MAY BE SELF-RELIANT

Tommy, aged 5, a keen, alert, busy, "outgoing" sort of lad, has a very active military existence in his play life. His toys are a miniature rifle, a soldier hat, a cannon, a bomber, and an army truck. Most of his play activity is reduced to war games, and much of his conversation has to do with his concept of war. He is a sturdy boy who takes everything in his stride, and his imaginary ideas are immediately converted into objective activities. He has no fear or even anxiety and has found a satisfactory outlet for his fantasies in objective play.

ANOTHER NEEDS MORE REASSURANCE

Phyllis, aged 8, has been unduly perturbed for the past two

years about the war situation. Frequently her nights are disturbed by terrifying dreams, and she is constantly demanding reassurance from her mother that nothing is going to happen to her or to her family. This youngster has always been a sensitive child. She complains about her looks, that she is not liked by other children, that she doesn't get a square deal. She thinks that life is pretty difficult and is always seeking attention.

The difference in temperament of these two children, even though they belong to the same family, is somewhat indicative of the importance of considering every child as needing individual consideration.

TEACH THEM THAT FEAR IS NOT COWARDICE

It will be most helpful for all children to understand that being afraid is not being cowardly and that life presents in our everyday routine many situations that require unusual courage—the tooth that has to be pulled; telling the truth when we know that someone we love is going to be unhappy and that punishment may result; speaking for the first time before the class; the first ride on a bicycle or perhaps a venturesome slide down a very steep hill; the first spring from a diving board. These are all experiences attended by a bit of anxiety, sometimes actual fear, but most children will recall that fear of what was going to happen was worse than the actual experience.

CHILDREN SHOULD NOT BE TEASED BECAUSE THEY FEAR

It is very important that children be not teased or humiliated because of their fears, but encouraged to carry on bravely in spite of them in an environment that is as normal, natural, and happy as circumstances may permit. Most children will find out that they have the capacity to "take it," and as soon as the initial reaction to danger has passed they will have a sense of relief and new courage, and confidence will be established with which to meet subsequent threats.

THE SECOND SUGGESTION:

HELP YOUR CHILDREN TO CONTINUE THEIR EVERYDAY LIVES WITH AS LITTLE CHANGE AS POSSIBLE

Parents will have to prepare themselves for a long job of maintaining family morale under emergency conditions. This can best be done by going about the daily business of living as much as possible as though conditions were normal. Under most circumstances parents have the delicate task of adjusting to one another members of the family who differ in age, temperament, and needs. Under circumstances of national emergency each one of these varying individual needs is peculiarly and particularly emphasized.

WAR BRINGS NEW PRESSURES ON THE FAMILY

The adults in the family are under new pressures in regard to work, to financial problems, to shifts in living conditions. Husbands will have longer hours of work; the rise in prices will affect the food budget; some items and some materials may be short and others may have to be substituted; the place of work or the home itself may be moved—any or all of these changes will bring along with them perplexing problems for the grown people in the family to solve. Women will realize that their husbands are facing important changes in their work at the same time that their children have need of particular attention. Husbands will be aware of this complexity in their wives' responsibilities and must be prepared for their anxiety and occasional confusion about where to place their emphasis at a particular moment.

EACH MEMBER OF THE FAMILY SHOULD FEEL USEFUL

The elderly members are likely to feel useless and in the way. It would be helpful to find some way to make them feel valuable and to find occupations that will relieve their anxieties or at least keep them manageable. Each adult in a family must try to understand and be as sympathetic as possible toward the others who are having to adjust to new tensions, pressures,

excitement, and changes. Total war cannot leave anyone untouched, no matter how physically safe or remote.

PREPARE YOUR CHILDREN FOR DEFENSE

Each child in the family will feel the crisis differently and will understand it in terms of his age, sex, and temperament—his own unique make-up. It is the business of parents to understand these differing reactions so far as possible and to be ready whenever their help is needed.

Fathers are always enormously important in their children's lives—never more so than in times of anxiety and confusion. And yet, in war they are likely to be away from home for longer hours of work or in service of one sort or another and to be tired and preoccupied when they are at home. Even so, fathers, knowing that their strength and influence are vital to the whole family, should try to stay close to their children and to be with them as much as possible. This may mean changing some of the hours for meals or even bedtime, but it will be well worth the children's losing some sleep for the sake of seeing their father. They will feel greater security under changed conditions if they know the family is facing life together.

Of course, this will be more difficult if the father's work or service takes him completely out of the home. But he can still remain in the thoughts and conversation as an important part of the children's lives and an essential part of the family itself. During wars there are fewer and fewer men about, and children miss them and sense an upset in the normal balance of life. If the father must be away altogether, perhaps other male relatives may be ready to assume some responsibility toward the children. Group activities led by men in the neighborhood or in school or church will help without changing the loyalty and affection of a child for his own father and home.

THE LITTLE CHILD

It is a comfort to parents to know that their very small children, even through kindergarten age, cannot imagine or see in the future what our anxieties and knowledge make very real

to us. They can imagine only what they themselves have experienced. They may seem to understand because they pick up the terms that other people around them use. Sensing fear or anxiety, they may describe things with the same words as are current with adults but which do not have the same meanings for them. For instance, one little boy understands the war as a big game to catch Hitler. Another very dependable child tells about his dreams of Hitler coming over here and taking everything away. To most small children Hitler symbolizes all "badness," and is the object of their feeling of antagonism.

TREAT THEIR PROBLEMS NORMALLY, UNEXCITEDLY

Actually children will show fear less by their words than by their actions. They may be irritable, hard to please, restless, or they may even make the most of the chance to get special attention and privileges. A kindergarten teacher reported that after the first air-raid drill there was next day an irritability and restlessness throughout the group that the children themselves couldn't connect with anything in particular. Try to treat all these behavior problems as normally as you can; try not to let any of your children, whatever their ages, live in anxious anticipation of dangers that do not exist.

THE LITTLE CHILD NEEDS PERSONAL COMFORT

When a situation arises to cause actual fear, such as alarming war talk, drills, or an event of real danger, parents know from long experience that the best way to comfort a little child is to take him in their arms, to cuddle him close, or hold his hand. The only security he knows is the personal one of the grown people in his life, and their protection is essential to him in moments of insecurity and fear. This protected feeling can be given in the simplest and most direct fashion by giving the little child physical security and comfort.

In preparing for defense, all parents need to do is to remember their own childhood experiences and the things that have happened in the past with their children, to take note of the way they felt and acted so that when an emergency arises they will automatically do what will comfort and sustain each member

of the family. The little child can feel your fears through your touch, even though your face and voice seem calm, but it is wise to remember that if you have confidence in yourself he too will be calm.

GIVE SIMPLE INSTRUCTIONS, AND NOT TOO MANY

Another suggestion about the little child is to avoid too much drilling and preparation, but instead to give a few very simple and specific instructions and some small responsibility that is especially his to be occupied with—what he is to do, where he is to go, and a favorite toy to be taken with him. It would be well to shift his toys occasionally, so that he does not become too attached to one. Little children derive much comfort and reassurance from familiar things, so a well-loved object will help at once to make unfamiliar surroundings seem less strange and fearful.

One important bit of advice comes out of the experience of England. Let your children express their fears frankly. Don't let them try too hard to be brave. It is going to be perfectly natural for children as well as adults to be frightened by some things that may occur, even by the talk and uncertainty and preparations in the community. Let them see the naturalness of their fear. Let them express it. Try to be natural yourselves. Reassure them by the physical comfort of contact and warmth and food, and the possession of some favorite toy to cling to.

THE GRADE-SCHOOL GROUP

Generally speaking, the child in the grades has quite different reactions from the little ones at home or in kindergarten. The boy or girl of 8 or 10 is intensely interested in activity and in the way things work. He is quite alive to all that is going on around him. He likes to dramatize his activities as well as the things that he sees and hears. The war, remote or near at hand, will give him considerable excitement and fun. Already many school children are changing their time-honored game of prisoner's base and cops and robbers to air raids and ambulance and stretcher drills and real war games.

THEY STILL NEED TO FEEL CLOSE TO THEIR PARENTS

This is all right for the daytime, but these same children away from the gang at night are often subject to daydreams and nightmares of very real terror. Often what children of this age suffer in their own imaginations when alone is far worse than any reality and actually more harmful. A child of this age has begun to belong to a gang and to make some efforts at emancipation from home. But with all his apparent independence he is in need of parental support when he is worried or frightened. It is essential that parents, even while they allow this child his independence and group activity, should keep in close and tactful contact with him, so that he may express to them his fears and anxieties. His wish to talk over his worries is more likely to be expressed at nighttime when he is away from the security of the group.

GIVE THEM SOME RESPONSIBILITIES

Suggestions to help this age are: First, a frank discussion of the facts about the war and the particular situation of the family. This will help to get rid of imagined horrors. Then, to bring fantasy and reality closer together, children of school age should have definite duties and responsibilities. There should be group discussions in school and at home, and specific tasks should be assigned. Mothers can plan beforehand with their children to do certain things—depending on them to put up window curtains, to see that little children stay away from windows, and similar tasks. They can be junior air-raid wardens, can do junior Red Cross work and first aid, and can start learning many things that will be useful to them and the community later. At the same time they will be dealing actively with reality, and in facing reality they will be getting help for themselves.

THE ADOLESCENT GROUP

Little as we are likely to think so, the adolescent group is going to require our understanding and support as much as the other two. We instinctively protect our little children, and we

know the continuing need of our young school children. But the high-school girl and boy and those just starting to work present problems at all times that are complex and often difficult to understand. More than any other group in the community are their lives profoundly changed and their difficulties increased by war. We can maintain our young children's lives reasonably the same under changing conditions; we can celebrate birthdays, have small parties, transfer their usual games to war interests with a minimum of upset. But adolescence is a terrific speeding-up process anyway and war makes it more so.

War forces our young people to grow up almost overnight. We expect the boys to become soldiers and the girls to take their places in home services at an age when ordinarily we are still treating them as big children. Under war conditions adults are needed and demanded, and our eager, conscientious youth are going to meet that demand. They will be taking a responsible place in the community and in the home, and their capacities will be developing at breath-taking speed.

BE SENSITIVE TO THEIR CHANGES OF MOOD

At the same time, though the adolescent's imagination is fully developed and his sense of duty especially keen, a heavy toll of his emotions is going to be taken. At this particular age he will not show his emotions as directly as younger children, or even as simply as adults do. Adolescents try to hide their feelings from adults, so let us be as sensitive as we can to the changes of mood that they will be feeling, and at the same time let us respect their wish for privacy. War rushes the process of moving from the complete protection of infancy to the emancipation of adulthood, but it cannot altogether alter that process. Occasionally our adolescents will return to their childhood need of protection, comfort, and security. Let us try now more than ever to recognize this need when it arises and be ready to satisfy it.

HELP THEM TO GROW UP WISELY

Specific problems will arise in connection with adolescent responsibilities and opportunities. For instance, young people will

become economically independent much earlier in wartime. This sudden growing up is not all a loss. Many of our youth have lived through a lot of deprivation during the depression, and the opportunity for work is a real advantage and will make up for some of the things they have not had. The boy or girl who has had no money or has had a small weekly allowance will go out and get a job and be earning his own freedom and planning his own recreation.

Again, early marriages are a part of the speeding-up process and may be looked upon with disfavor or even fear for the future. But really it will be reassuring to parents to know that early marriage is far better than the postponement that occurred for financial reasons during the depression. The big problem is to help adolescents to use their new freedom and independence wisely. Parents cannot expect the same rules and behavior to be maintained now as in other days. But they can suggest sensible uses for money and plans for savings, can be sympathetic with young love affairs, and can recognize the growing adult in their midst.

THE MORE RESPONSIBILITIES THEY CAN ASSUME, THE BETTER

The best safeguard for our prematurely adult young people is to take them fully into preparations for defense and actual war work. The more responsibilities they can assume, the more naturally they and their families can accept their relatively sudden maturity. Girls can take over more duties at home. Outside, in addition to Red Cross and other work, they can help in nursery schools and centers for child care. Boys can take their turn as airplane spotters and at other defense duties and can also prepare in their spare time for specific jobs in radio, airplane, and auto mechanics and repair work, scientific farming and gardening, and the like. Those still in school should have definite courses directed toward war and relief training, home and farm economics with a special view to the war situation; out-of-school hours should be filled with jobs that will satisfy their urge to be of service and their need for adult responsibility.

PREPARE YOUR FAMILY FOR ITS WARTIME PLACE IN THE COMMUNITY

Parents are the most important adults in a child's life. Their behavior and way of living under all conditions have the most profound effect on their children. But all are members of a community and share in a common responsibility for the schools, the local defense councils, and the national government. It is not enough to use common sense and good judgment in keeping a normal balance at home, for school has a large place in every child's life, and his education and his experiences with his own group are of vital importance to him.

From Washington to the smallest village, our government of which each one of us is a part is concerned with our welfare and safety and above all with the protection of our children and of the family group. Each community is working out its own plans within the general plan, and co-operation to the fullest extent is urgently desired. In emergencies all must follow common instructions which will differ in each community and school according to the particular needs of each. All eventualities, no matter how remote, are being taken into account, and plans are being made for them. Many of the plans may never be needed, but it is reassuring to know that every possible precaution is being taken for the children's safety, health, and happiness. For instance, plans are under consideration for evacuation if that should ever be necessary, and no effort will be spared to prevent the home and school life from being upset any more than it has to be.

If parents can realize that when their children are beyond the range of their own protective care they are under that of people in schools or community groups specially selected and trained for the job, they will face the future with greater courage and confidence. Each one, in developing confidence in himself and in those working together for the benefit of all, helps to safeguard the children, the home, and the nation.

GROUP ACTIVITIES

Confidence in and co-operation with teachers, those directing the community programs of preparedness, and the national

government is a part of the job that parents are undertaking in the big scheme of defense. Other adults besides a child's parents can and do feel the deepest concern and responsibility for him. They can and do give him wise and loving care. Sometimes children, especially adolescents, express themselves more freely and take advice more easily from older friends outside the family circle than they do at home. Often an adult of tact, wisdom, and sympathy can be the center of a whole group of young people who will unburden themselves there without fear of increasing the perplexities of their families. Such grown people, often parents themselves, will have an important place in the community program for defense.

CHILDREN FIND STRENGTH IN ONE ANOTHER

Activities of peacetime will be increased in such groups as church clubs and young people's associations, in Scout troops, recreation centers, and similar groups. Experience has shown that even little children derive a great deal of security and comfort from other children and from members of a group. The school-age child who has begun to get his satisfaction from the gang finds great enjoyment and security in his group. From that time on, group contacts mean more and more to children. It is also true that children of all ages help each other to overcome fear and develop a companionship in interests together and in physical contact with each other like holding hands, or even touching one another, that is almost as fundamentally protective as the security offered by adults. For instance, one little child in an English center always went to sleep with his hand on the shoulder of the child in the cot next to his.

An example of children's group interests and support and the wise care by adults in charge of them comes from the first air-raid test in a large city in this country. A little boy of 6 on his return home was asked what had happened, where they went, and what they did. At first he said it was a secret and he couldn't tell. On further questioning it seemed his class had continued their Christmas preparations in the place assigned to them for safety, and the boy's one idea was not to let out the secret of his mother's Christmas present! The air-raid drill had not made the slightest impression on him or his class.

We are told that in England children sleep through air raids and that they have shown very little emotional disturbance due to this experience. A recent broadcast* from England is interesting not only on this point but in relation to other points made in this chapter. The people of Australia in preparing for possible bombing by Japanese asked how their children were likely to stand it. In answer to this question the broadcast stated:

Our experience ought to encourage them. The school medical officer of the county of London reported last week that there was no evidence among London children of any nervous disorder or shock caused by air raids. They stood it as well as adults, maybe better. Nor did living in air-raid shelters do them any harm. We had no epidemic of disease.

The bad effects seemed to be first on their education. When hundreds of thousands of the children were evacuated to the country there was a shortage of school buildings. The schools were taken over for Civilian Defense, and a good many children got little or no education. When the problem was fully understood it was put right, and by last June nearly 98 per cent of British children were once more getting full-time schooling.

The second bad effect was an increase in what is called juvenile delinquency, but what the ordinary parent calls "naughtiness." A lot more children got in trouble with the police in the first year of the war than in the last . . . The causes were chiefly the breaking up of the home life and home discipline. Fathers were in the army and mothers were doing war work. Children had too much time on their hands. Not being able to go to school, the ease of stealing from bombed buildings and the excitement of the war in general helped them to kick up the devil.

This broadcast went on to emphasize the problem of the 16- or 17-year-old boy who suddenly earns high wages. Not having had much if any money before, he has no idea how to spend it, and in England it was found that he spent it on excitements and foolish pleasures that finally got some of them into more or less serious trouble. The solution seems to be to reduce the amount of spending money and to have the balance put into

*Rebroadcast by WOR on Sunday, January 11, 1942, of a BBC broadcast by E. A. Montague.

various sorts of savings and defense budgets. This lets the adolescent help carry the burden of the war as an adult would and at the same time provide for his own future.

The most important things we can learn from this report are that children do not suffer so greatly from anxiety or shock but that the upset in home life and in their schooling has the worst effect upon them. It is an encouraging message, especially in view of the fact that all the plans of our government have taken this into account and are calculated to avoid disturbance to family and school routine so far as that may be possible.

PREPARE YOUR CHILDREN BY HELPING THEM FACE LIFE

We cannot protect our children from life. We can only help them to face it and go forward. In order to be a part of the community, children must take their own share of responsibility along with adults. It is conceivable that if children are separated from their parents during periods of stress, a distance will grow up between them based on the fact that the young persons have nothing in common with the sufferings of their parents. Pioneer parents did not leave their children in safer places while they pushed west to build a new country. Those children shared in the building.

Wise parents do not try to seek complete safety for their children. We have had more deaths from automobile accidents than England has had from air raids in the same length of time. But we do not forbid our children to ride in cars. We do emphasize precaution in cars. We must learn and practice all proper precautions in regard to air raids and war in general, and then go about our business, not preoccupied with danger but intent on doing the best job possible. We must encourage our children to accept the challenge of work and the opportunity to face life's realities.

Prepare yourselves for whatever the future may bring.
Help your children to continue living their everyday lives.

Your children can take it if you can.

A CHILDREN'S CHARTER IN WARTIME

WE ARE in total war against the aggressor nations. We are fighting again for human freedom and especially for the future of our children in a free world.

Children must be safeguarded—and they can be safeguarded—in the midst of this total war so that they can live and share in that future. They must be nourished, sheltered, and protected even in the stress of war production so that they will be strong to carry forward a just and lasting peace.

Our American Republics sprang from a sturdy yearning for tolerance, independence, and self-government. The American home has emerged from the search for freedom. Within it the child lives and learns through his own efforts the meaning and responsibilities of freedom.

We have faith in the children of the New World—faith that if our generation does its part now, they will renew the living principles in our common life, and make the most of them.

Both as a wartime responsibility and as steppingstones to our future—and to theirs—we call upon citizens, young and old, to join together to —

- I. Guard children from injury in danger zones.
- II. Protect children from neglect, exploitation, and undue strain in defense areas.
- III. Strengthen the home life of children whose parents are mobilized for war or war production.
- IV. Conserve, equip, and free children of every race and creed to take their part in democracy.

Prepared by The Advisory Commission on Children in War Time, for the Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, Katharine F. Lenroot, *Chief*.

I. DANGER ZONES

"Guard children from injury in danger zones"

These danger zones line our coasts along the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf—especially where there are military targets, industrial plants, business centers, oil tanks or the like; also, closely built home areas which might be bombed in an effort to break the morale of defense production workers.

These zones are a first charge on our Civilian Defense program but there is no certainty that inland districts and communities will not be subject to air raids or other forms of attack.

Children first in all plans for protection. The first step is their registration and identification.

Evacuation of children from such zones, if needed, as a sound precaution; advance plans for adequate reception and care in their places of refuge. Mothers to go with their children whenever possible.

"War vacations" for city children. By the expansion of summer vacation camps conducted under proper supervision, staffed in part by volunteers, and utilizing surplus commodities, and other aids, great numbers of children can be removed from exposed districts at relatively little expense. These camp demonstrations would be an admirable test of evacuation methods and an investment for health.

Appropriate immunization of all children against communicable disease.

Helping children to meet the anticipations and realities of wartime. Childhood anxiety can be as devastating as disease. Not only parents, but doctors, nurses, teachers, recreation leaders, settlement workers, child welfare and child guidance workers can help to preserve the child's sense of security, which is his greatest need.

II. DEFENSE AREAS

"Protect children from neglect and undue strain in defense areas"

Vital to the cause of the United Nations is an ever-increasing stream of guns, tanks, and planes and other war equipment and materials from the United States. A thousand communities are involved in their production. Broken working time due to sickness of the worker, or his wife or child, or to disturbed family life handicaps production at countless points.

Therefore, the following are essential:

Adequate health, education, and welfare services must be maintained for children and their parents in each of the thousand communities where war production or military camps are established. To accomplish this will require proper staffing with doctors, health officers, nurses, social workers, teachers, recreation leaders and librarians. It will call for adequate hospitals, clinics, schools, playgrounds, recreational facilities, and day care centers. Each of these communities will need to mobilize all of its resources within a co-ordinated plan. Many will need assistance to supplement existing staff and equipment.

The assignment of obstetricians and pediatricians to defense areas should be given special consideration.

Child guidance clinics should be provided wherever possible to help parents and children overcome insecurity associated with dislocations in family life. Such dislocations exaggerate the normal anxieties of children and create situations that require special service.

School opportunities must be expanded to meet the new demands of expanding populations. This should include nursery schools for young children.

Recreation leaders, group workers, and child welfare workers are urgently needed in defense communities, where crowded conditions mean overtaxing of facilities for play of little children and of recreation centers for older boys and girls;

increase in harmful employment of children; and mounting juvenile delinquency.

III. HOMES IN WARTIME

"Strengthen the home life of children whose parents are mobilized for war or war production"

To children in wartime the home is vital as a center of security and hope and love. To our fighting men the safety and protection of their families is the center of what they fight for. To men on the production front the welfare of their families and homes is basic to morale.

Migration to new and crowded communities, the absence of the father in military service, priorities unemployment on the one hand, and the employment of mothers on the other, are creating problems in homes that affect every member of the family.

Children of our fighting men. Full provision must be made for the economic needs of children whose fathers are in the service and for medical and hospital care for wives and children.

A government insurance program for civilians injured or killed as a result of war activities should supplement our social security program.

Adequate housing is essential to the protection of home life. In housing projects facilities should be provided for health services and group activities for children.

Employment of mothers and day care of children. As plans develop for the participation of women in war industry, it must be recognized that the care of young children is the first responsibility of mothers. For children whose mothers are employed or planning to enter employment, it is the responsibility of the community, through adequate planning and support, to see that parents have assistance in planning for their needs and that the children have the best possible care—not forgetting health supervision, opportunity for nursery education and play for the youngest,

recreation outside of school hours for those who attend school.

Day care for children in crowded areas where home facilities are limited. Such children should have opportunities similar to those provided for children of working mothers.

Economic security. To all parents economically unable to maintain a home for their children, government help should be extended through such measures as aid to dependent children, general assistance, and benefits for temporary and permanent disability.

IV. CHILDREN THE COUNTRY OVER

“Conserve, equip, and free children of every race and creed to take their part in democracy”

The Children's Charter drawn up at the White House Conference in 1930 and the recommendations of the 1940 Conference are still a challenge to the people. Here it is only in point to single out certain factors that take on new significance in the present war crisis.

Health and children. Good health in childhood lays the foundation for good health in later life. Children should have health supervision from the prenatal period through adolescence. Special planning is needed to overcome present and future shortages of doctors and nurses. As soon as possible every county in the United States should have public health nursing service, prenatal clinics, delivery care, child health conferences, and clinic and hospital service for sick children.

Food for children. The needs of children must be considered first in the event of national or local shortages of foods, especially of milk and the other protective foods. If our country is to be strong, all children must have the food they need for buoyant health and normal growth, and information must be available to parents concerning the family food requirements. Family incomes should be sufficient to assure to each member of the family the right

amounts and the right kinds of food. School meals are an effective means of supplementing home nutrition and educating children and their families in good food habits. The extension of penny milk to all children is an important aid in assuring to them their full share of this essential food.

Social services for children. Communities should be equipped to supplement the care and training given by home and school when the welfare of the child demands it. Child welfare and child guidance resources of the state, county, and city governments should be expanded to provide appropriate service and care for all children with special needs.

The right to play. More than ever in wartime recreation must be assured for children and youth through the full use and expansion as needed of all public and private leisure-time activities.

School and work. It is essential that children and youth be sound and well prepared in body and mind for the tasks of today and tomorrow. Their right to schooling should not be scrapped for the duration. Demands for the employment of children as a necessary war measure should be analyzed to determine whether full use has been made of available adult man power and to distinguish between actual labor shortage and the desire to obtain cheap labor. The education and wholesome development of boys and girls should be the first consideration in making decisions with regard to their employment or other contribution to our war effort. This means that no boy or girl shall be employed at wages that undermine the wages for adult labor; none under 14 years of age shall be part of the labor force; none under 16 shall be employed in manufacturing and mining occupations; none under 18 in hazardous occupations.

Health and education. A measure urgently needed at this time is complete medical examinations of all boys and girls of high-school age at regular intervals, with provision for correction of remediable defects. Provision should be made for a nationwide extension of health services for school

children including medical care as needed and health instruction, developed through the co-operation of health and education authorities. The need for health supervision and medical care for youth has been demonstrated until there is no longer any possibility of disregarding it.

Young children. In the war period special consideration should be given to the needs of all young children for security in the home and for opportunity to grow through association with other children in play and through the reassurance given by adults who have learned to understand their needs. Opportunity for nursery education should be made increasingly available to help meet situations created by the war.

Children in rural areas. More than half of the children of the nation live in country districts. Far more than city children they are likely to be handicapped by early and harmful employment, inadequate schools, and lack of other community facilities. The war effort must not increase these handicaps.

Participation in civilian mobilization programs. Boys and girls should participate in home and community efforts for the war through activities appropriate to their age and ability.

Every city, county, and state should review the needs of its children and youth in the light of these principles through a children's wartime commission or council or an existing organization designated to serve in this capacity, and should devise means to meet evident needs through the co-operative action of Federal, state, and local governments and private agencies.

Every effort should be made to keep the public informed of activities and needs in all phases of service for children and to provide for participation of professional associations, organized labor, farm groups, and other organizations of citizens concerned with children, in the planning and development of these programs.

Provision should be made as rapidly as possible for training the professional workers needed to provide for extension of community programs to increasing numbers of children.

There should be no state lines nor barriers of race or creed impeding what we do for children in our war effort. They may not live in danger zones or defense areas; they will still be subject to the strains of these times. They should not be forgotten Americans. Their future is our future.

THE AUTHORS

PEARL S. BUCK

Novelist

EVERETT R. CLINCHY, Ph.D.

President, National Conference of Christians and Jews

MARTHA M. ELIOT, M.D.

Associate Chief, Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor

DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER

Novelist

LAWRENCE K. FRANK

Formerly Assistant Vice President Josiah H. Macy, Jr. Foundation; Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial Fund.

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG

Director, Child Study Association of America

BRIG.-GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY

Director, Selective Service

SUSAN ISAACS, M.A., D.S.C.

Head, Department of Child Development, Institute of Education, London, England

DAVID M. LEVY, M.D.

Psychiatrist

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

Professor of Sociology, New York School of Social Work

MARK A. McCLOSKEY

Director of Recreation, Office of Defense Health and Welfare Service

HOWARD Y. McCLUSKY, Ph.D.

Assistant to the Vice President, University of Michigan;
Associate Director, American Youth Commission

PAUL V. McNUTT

Federal Security Administrator

THOMAS T. MACKIE, M.D.

Assistant Director, Commission on Tropical Medicine,
Board for the Investigation of Epidemic Diseases, War
Department

JAMES S. PLANT, A.M., M.D.

Director, Essex County Juvenile Clinic, Newark, New
Jersey

ELEANOR D. ROOSEVELT

ANNA M. ROSENBERG

Regional Director, Social Security Board, Region Two;
Regional Director of Defense Health and Welfare
Service

LOUISE STANLEY

Chief, Bureau of Home Economics, United States De-
partment of Agriculture

ANNA W. M. WOLF

Senior Staff Member, Family Consultation Service,
Child Study Association of America

CAROLINE ZACHRY

Director, Institute for Personality Development; Di-
rector Designate, Bureau of Child Guidance, New York
Board of Education

SUGGESTED READING

- Babies Are Human Beings* by Charles A. and Mary M. Aldrich. The Macmillan Company, 1938.
- Cambridge Survey, The*. Edited by Susan Isaacs, Sibyl Clement and Robert H. Thouless. Methuen, 1941.
- Children in the Family* by Harold H. Anderson. D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937.
- Children in the Family* by Florence Powdermaker and Louise Ireland Grimes. Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1940.
- Children in War Time*. Edited by John Rickman. The New Education Fellowship, 1940.
- Family Finance* by Howard F. Bigelow. J. B. Lippincott Company, 1936.
- Family, The* by Joseph K. Folsom. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1934.
- Family and Its Social Functions, The* by E. R. Groves. J. B. Lippincott Company, 1940.
- Family Past and Present* by B. J. Stern. D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.
- Happy Family, The* by John Levy and Ruth Munroe. Alfred A. Knopf, 1938.
- Love in the Machine Age* by Floyd Dell. Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1930.
- Modern Marriage* by Moses Jung. F. S. Croft & Co., 1940.
- New Horizons for the Family* by Una B. Sait. The Macmillan Company, 1938.
- Of Men and Women* by Pearl Buck. John Day Company, 1941.
- Parents' Manual, The* by Anna W. M. Wolf. Simon and Schuster, 1941.
- Personal Problems of Everyday Life* by Dorothy Baruch and Edward Lee Travis. D. Appleton-Century Company, 1941.
- Personality and the Cultural Pattern* by James S. Plant. The Commonwealth Fund, 1930.
- We the Parents* by Sidonie M. Gruenberg. Harper & Brothers, 1939.

THE FAMILY IN A WORLD AT WAR

Edited by

SIDONIE MATSNER GRUENBERG

Director, Child Study Association of America

In a war-torn world, the intense problems of normal family life become heightened for parents and children alike. Fears, reasonable and unreasonable, add strain to family living. Recognizing this, and believing that family morale is the basis of all morale—that the family gives or withholds that inner strength which people need in facing danger and uncertainty—Mrs. Gruenberg has edited a book dealing thoughtfully and practically with the problems which confront the family in this time of crisis.

Outstanding experts discuss such subjects as the child's need for help in keeping his balance and sanity in an atmosphere of emotional and spiritual conflict; the particular problems of the evacuated child; how good will and community team-work can solve the problem of the boom town whose facilities are burdened beyond capacity by soldiers and sailors pouring in on leave and civilian population mushrooming overnight; how the British experiment in community organization in areas receiving evacuated children can be applied to our boom towns and trailer camps; the need of a sense of responsibility and obligation if American democracy is to work.

The nutritional aspects of public morale, the share of youth in public life, the family in national defense, the impact of the draft upon the American family—these are but a few of the other problems effectively dealt with in a book which surely has a place in every Amer-

